Bible
Comment(O.T.)
Ezra
H

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION
OF THE
PESHITTA VERSION OF THE BOOK OF EZRA

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
SALES AGENTS

NEW YORK

LEMCKE & BUECHNER
30-32 EAST 20TH STREET

LONDON

HUMPHREY MILFORD
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

SHANGHAI

EDWARD EVANS & SONS, LTD.
30 NORTH SZECHUEN ROAD

Bible
Comment (O.T.)
Ezra
H

CONTRIBUTIONS TO ORIENTAL HISTORY AND PHILOLOGY

No. VII.

A Critical Examination
OF THE
Peshitta Version of the Book of Ezra

BY

CHARLES ARTHUR HAWLEY, S.T.M., PH. D.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE
INTERNATIONAL YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION COLLEGE
SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

194240
12.2.26

New York
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

1922

[All Rights Reserved]

5.10
7.7
H

11111
11111
11111
11111
11111

11111111 11111111 11111111

11111111 11111111 11111111 11111111

11111111
11111111
11111111
11111111
11111111

Made in Germany

Printed by W. DRUGULIN, Leipzig.

TO MY HONORED TEACHER
PROFESSOR JULIUS A. BEWER, PH. D., D. THEOL.
IN GRATITUDE
FOR HIS INSPIRING TEACHING, WISE
COUNSEL AND TRUE FRIENDSHIP.

NOTE

The present Study of the Peshitta text of the Book of Ezra fills a lacuna in the literature devoted to that translation of the Old Testament. Whether we agree or not with the conclusions reached by Dr. Hawley, everyone who reads the following pages must feel certain that he has gone deeply into the subject and has made use of all the material that is available.

Columbia University

Richard Gottheil.

1922.

PREFACE

This dissertation is the outcome of an investigation begun during postgraduate work in Union Theological Seminary in a Seminar conducted by Professor Julius A. Bewer. After reviewing the adverse criticisms of the scholars concerning the Peshitta Text of the Book of Ezra, and then carefully studying the Peshitta itself, I found that the value of the latter for textual criticism had been considerably underestimated and as a result almost entirely neglected. During further postgraduate study at the University of Basel, I continued my study of the Ezra text. Finally, during the summer semester of 1922 at the University of Halle-Wittenberg, I brought this work to the point where I offer my investigations to the public.

I take this opportunity gratefully to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor Richard J. H. Gottheil, and to Dr. Frederick Vanderburgh of Columbia University; to Professors Fagnani and Henry Preserved Smith of Union Theological Seminary; and to Professors Duhm, Alt, Wernle, and the late Friedrich Schulthess of the University of Basel; and to Professors Gunkel, Brockelmann, Bauer, and Dr. Hempel of the University of Halle-Wittenberg. To Professor Bauer of Halle and to Professor Budde of Marburg I express deep appreciation for valuable assistance given me in reading the proof. I gratefully acknowledge my special indebtedness

to Professor Julius A. Bower of Union Theological Seminary under whose sympathetic direction and inspiration I have done all my work.

University of Halle-Wittenberg in August 1922.

CHARLES ARTHUR HAWLEY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARNES, W. E., *Peshitta Text of Chronicles* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1897).
- BATTEN, L. W., *Ezra-Nehemiah* (New York, 1913).
- BERTHOLET, A., *Esra und Nehemia* (Tübingen, 1902).
- BEWER, J. A., *Der Text des Buches Ezra* (Göttingen, 1922).
- BLOCH, Joshua, *A Critical Examination of the Text of the Syriac Version of the Song of Songs*. *AJSL*, 1922.
- BUHL, F., *Canon and Text of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh, 1894).
- BURKITT, F. C., Article "Text and Versions", *Ency. Biblica*.
- CORNILL, C. H., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen, 1913). Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel (Leipzig, 1886).
- DAVIES, T. W., *Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther* (New York, 1909).
- DUHM, B., *Die Psalmen* (Tübingen, 1922).
- DUVAL, R., *La Littérature Syriaque* (Paris, 1907).
- GUTHE, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*, (Leipzig and New York, 1901).
- KLOSTERMANN, A., *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (München, 1896).
- MEYER, Ed., *Die Entstehung des Judenthums* (Halle, 1896).
- NESTLE, E., *Bibelübersetzungen (Syrische Übersetzungen)* PRE III.
- NÖLDEKE, Theodor, *Die Alttestamentliche Literatur* (Leipzig, 1868).
- RAHLFS, Beiträge zur Textkritik der Peschitta *ZATW* 1889.
- SIEGFRIED, D. C., *Esra, Nehemia, und Esther* (Göttingen, 1901).
- STEUERNAGEL, C., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen, 1912).
- SWETE, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, 1914).
- TORREY, C., *Ezra Studies* (Chicago, 1910).
- WELLHAUSEN, J., *Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen, 1871).
- WRIGHT, W., *A Short History of Syriac Literature* (London 1894). *The Homilies of Aphraates* (London, 1869).

ABBREVIATIONS

- AJSL, American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
BDB, Brown, Driver, Briggs. Hebrew Dictionary.
Esd., I Esdras Swete, Old Testament in Greek.
Esd. A, Alexandrian Codex of I Esdras.
Esd. B, Vatican Codex of I Esdras.
Esd. L, Lagarde's text of I Esdras in "Libri Veteris Testamenti Syriace".
1861.
Esd. Syr., Syriac of I Esdras, according to Lagarde.
G (LXX), The Greek translation, according to Swete's Edition.
GA, Alexandrian Codex of the Greek Ezra.
GB, Vatican Codex of the Greek Ezra.
GL, Lagarde's Edition of Ezra.
MT, Masoretic Text.
Neh., Nehemiah.
PRE, Realencyclopädie f. Prot. Theol. u. Kirche. 3. Aufl.
S, Syriac (Peshitta).
Vulg., Vulgate.
L, Lee's Edition of the Syriac Text.
P, Paris Polyglott.
RV, American Revised Version (1901).
U, Urumia Edition of Syriac Text.
W, London Polyglott (Walton).
ZATW, Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
+, Addition to the text.

INTRODUCTION.

The Bible of the Syriac Church, like that of the Alexandrian (Greek), was the work of several translators and was made at different times. After the ninth century, Syriac Mss. of the Old Testament generally went by the name of Peshitta. The origin of the Peshitta lies in obscurity. Internal evidence points to characteristics both of Jewish and of Christian translators.

Nöldeke¹ has stated the facts in the case as follows: "Sie (Peschita) zeigt, namentlich im Pentateuch, nicht bloß in der Auffassung, sondern selbst in den Ausdrücken eine entschiedene Verwandtschaft mit den Targumen, theils mit den officiellen, theils mit den übrigen. Man hat deshalb in neuerer Zeit auch die Peschita ohne weiteres als eine jüdische Uebersetzung beanspruchen wollen, aber dagegen sprechen doch gewichtige Gründe. Manche Stellen zeigen in ihr eine entschiedene christliche Auffassung, zum Theil in Widerspruch mit allen sonstigen alten Uebersetzungen und in einer Weise, die nicht durch nachträgliche Interpolation erklärt werden kann; namentlich finden sich solche Stellen im Syrischen Psalter. Ferner ist die Peschita, soweit wir wissen, nie von Juden gebraucht — der Verfasser des Targums zu den Sprüchen unterwarf sie erst einer Umarbeitung im jüdischen Sinn —, während sie stets bei allen christlichen Parteien

¹ Nöldeke, *Die Alttestamentliche Literatur*, S. 262. Cf. also Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, p. 186.

Syriens als Kirchenübersetzung gedient hat. Auch ist der Dialect, in dem sie abgefasst ist, derselbe, welcher im syrischen Neuen Testament herrscht und der überhaupt die Schriftsprache der christlichen Syrer bildet, deren erstes Monument für uns wenigstens eben sie ist, während wir keine jüdischen Schriften in dieser Mundart kennen."

Wright¹ similarly holds that the Peshitta is "not improbably a monument of the learning and the zeal of the Christians of Edessa. Possibly Jewish converts, or even Jews, took a part in it, for some books (such as the Pentateuch and Job) are very literally rendered whereas the coincidences with the LXX (which are particularly numerous in the prophetic books) show the hand of Christian translators or revisers. That Jews should have had at any rate a consultative share in this work need not surprise us, when we remember that Syrian fathers, such as Aphraates, in the middle of the fourth century, and Jacob of Edessa, in the latter half of the seventh, had frequent recourse, like Jerome, to the scholars of the synagogue."

An example of purely Jewish translation is pointed out by Nöldeke²: "Eine besondere Stellung nimmt aber die syrische Uebersetzung der Chronik ein. Diese ist allerdings ein reines Targum. Sie zeigt vielfache Zusätze, Umschreibungen und rabbinische Ausdeutungen: die Aengstlichkeit bei der Vermeidung von Anthropomorphismen ist hier ganz wie in den Targumen. Den rein jüdischen Character zeigt die Stelle 1. Chron. 5 2, wo es heisst: "aus Juda wird hervorgehen der König Messias"; wer diesen Zusatz gemacht hat, für den war doch Christus noch nicht gekommen. Bei diesem wenig gelesenen Buche haben die Syrer also ein jüdisches Targum arglos übernommen."

¹ Wright, *Syriac Literature*, p. 3.

² Nöldeke, *AL*, S. 263 f.

The antiquity of the Peshitta has long been recognized. Nöldeke says:¹ "Die Peschita ist wohl die älteste aller christlichen Bibelübersetzungen. Bei der starken Ausbreitung des Christentums in Syrien und Mesopotamien schon in dessen frühesten Zeiten konnte man eines allgemein verständlichen Textes des damals noch allein als kanonisch geltenden Alten Testaments nicht lange entbehren. Für den heiligen Ephraim (gestorben 373) ist die Peschita denn auch schon ein altes Werk. Für ein hohes Alter spricht auch die Reception bei allen syrischen Secten, die sich doch sonst unter einander so bitter haßten, und ferner das oben dargelegte Verhältnis zur jüdischen Tradition."

The Edessene Canon omitted Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah.² The Nestorians further omitted Esther. Whether this indicates that the Chronicler's work was translated into Syriac at a later time than the first translations, we cannot say. Wright points out³ "that all these books are cited by Aphraates, and that they all appear in the Codex Ambrosianus." Later the books at first omitted were received into the Canon of the Peshitta. At what time we do not know.

No interpretations in Ezra indicate the hand of a Christian. This may be due to the content of the book which gave no occasion where a Christian would be led to make a theological gloss. The entire translation indicates the work of a most careful biblical scholar. The Syriac translation of Ezra is in no case slavishly literal as is that of the Pentateuch but it is often paraphrastic. Why should it not be so? The translator wanted to bring out the meaning of the original as effectively as possible, and he felt that this could be done in a number of cases better by a paraphrase than

¹ Nöldeke, *AL*, S. 264.

² Duval, *Lit. Syr.* p. 32; Nestle, *PRE3* III S. 170.

³ Wright, *Syr. Lit.*, p. 5. *Homilies of Aphraates*, vol. I. pgs. 48, 358, 376.

by a very literal translation. Thus he put into language intelligible to all who might read his work, certain phrases which, if literally rendered, would, in his time, have had no meaning.¹

In 263 for example, the Hebrew עַד עַמַּד כְּהֵן לְאוֹרִים וּלְתַמִּים is rendered by S. ܐܕܡܐ ܕܥܡܕܐ ܕܟܗܢܐ ܕܠܐܘܪܝܡ ܕܠܬܡܝܡ. A comparison with the Greek translations (G & Esd., G ἕως ἀναστῆ ἱερεὺς τοῖς φωτίζουσιν καὶ τοῖς τελείοις, Esd. ἐνδεδυμένος τὴν δῆλωσιν καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν) shows that all three paraphrased the text but that S. has given the clearest explanation of the meaning of the ancient oracular device. G. makes no sense; Esd. is better than G. but certainly inferior to S.

Not only in this case, but all the way through, a comparison of S. with G. shows that the Peshitta version of Ezra was not influenced by G. This is against the opinion of Siegfried.² The cases in which S. and G. agree against MT are of so unimportant a nature that the Syriac translator may never have read G.³ It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that Siegfried's statement should have been accepted as valid for more than twenty years. Evidently nobody has ever examined into its truth.

Again, the generally accepted opinion in regard to the independent value of S. is also false. Siegfried holds that the Syriac "ist oft mehr Umschreibung als Uebersetzung." Klostermann says that the translation is of little value due to scribal errors and the "reine Willkür des Punktators."⁴ Torrey in his "*Ezra Studies*" goes even so far as to say, "the

¹ Cf. 263, 94. Any reader of the English Bible who has had no scientific training is under a handicap in not understanding such phrases as "urim and tummim", which an unskilled reader of S. would not have experienced.

² Siegfried, *Ezra, Nehemia und Esther Handkommentar* S. 9 ("ist von den LXX beeinflusst").

³ Cf. G & S. vs. MT 4 10 12, 5 5, 7 8, 19, 25, 8 36, 9 1.

⁴ Realencyclopaedie, Art. *Ezra-Nehemia*.

Syriac and Arabic versions of the canonical Chron.-Ezra-Neh. have long been known to be late and wellnigh worthless—the Arabic absolutely so—and any attempt to make a critical use or ‘investigation’ of them is a waste of time.”¹ Batten in his commentary on Ezra ignores S. absolutely; and Löhr in his edition of Ezra in Kittel’s “Biblia Hebraica” uses it only three times. Others³ dismiss the Syriac Version without a mention or hold it to be of little value. In fact, until the publication of Professor Bewer’s “*Der Text des Buches Ezra*”,⁴ S. has been wellnigh friendless. Professor Bewer has done much to correct the erroneous ideas regarding S.

When we undertake a comparison between the Hebrew and Syriac, we are at once confronted with the lack of a critical edition of S. The Peshitta text is found only in the Codex Ambrosianus, in the Paris and Walton (London) Polyglotts, and has been reprinted three times by missionary societies. The text found in the Paris Polyglott is that edited by Gabriel Sionita from a late Ms. This, the “editio princeps”, was printed in 1645, and in 1657 reproduced in the London Polyglott. The latter is a careful reprint, there being but one variant spelling (619). In 1823 Lee produced an edition for the British and Foreign Bible Society. This, the most accessible edition, reproduces with slight variation the text of the Paris Polyglott. In 1852 the American Missionaries at Urumia published an edition in Nestorian characters, fully punctated and in a simplified spelling.⁵ Another edition, published in 1887 at Mosul, I have been

¹ Torrey, *Ezra Studies* p. 64.

² Batten, *Commentary on Ezra-Nehemiah* in ICC series 1913.

³ Cf. Steuernagel, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, § 17.

⁴ Bewer, *Der Text des Buches Ezra*, (Göttingen, 1922).

⁵ The Urumia Edition has the classical and modern Syriac in parallel columns.

unable to obtain; but from all inquiries, I learn that it has no independent value. The editions are really the same, all of them being reprints of the Paris Polyglott.

A minute comparison of the Paris (P), Walton (W), and Lee (L) gives the following result:

3 11 WP ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ L ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ.

4 2 W ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ PL ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ.

6 19 WL ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ P ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ. This is a variant spelling. One form is as correct as the other.

A similar comparison of Paris, Walton, Lee, and Urumia (U) yields this result:

3 11 U ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ WP ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ L ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ. U omits ⲉ reading: "they shouted a shout of joy"; it is evidently an improved edition of L.

4 2 W ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ ULP ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ. The mistake is in W. Cf. above.

4 10 WLP ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ U ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ. Here an attempt has been made to bring U closer to MT — ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ.

6 9 LP ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ WU ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ. Variant spellings of the same word.

8 26 WPL ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ U ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ. Here U has been corrected by MT which reads ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ.

9 2 WPL ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ U ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ, MT ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ.

From this comparison, it is evident that U was made with MT at hand as a corrective.

In the following particulars also U differs from PLW:
a) Ribui is often omitted in the plurals; b) ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ is omitted in 5 15; c) simplified spelling is considerably used, *e. g.* ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ and ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ are omitted in such words as ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ (PLW) which U writes ⲉⲃⲉⲛⲧ.

It is apparent that for all practical purpose these various editions are of equal value, since they all represent one and the same text. I have used *L.* because it is the most convenient.

Unfortunately, the Mss. of the Book of Ezra have not

been collated since the collation by Thorndyke of the Usher, Pococke, and Cambridge Mss. in vol. vi of Walton's Polyglott, which is reproduced here: 2 13 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 2 20 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 2 25 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 2 22 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 2 36 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 2 43 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 2 46 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 2 52 [אֲנִיכֵם] Poc. אֲנִיכֵם. 2 47 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 2 70 [אֲנִיכֵם] Hebr. postulat אֲנִיכֵם. 3 5 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם scribe ex Heb. אֲנִיכֵם. 3 9 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם lege etsi contra libros. 4 5 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 4 10 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 4 13 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 4 11 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 4 17 [אֲנִיכֵם] lege ex Heb. אֲנִיכֵם. 4 18 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 6 4 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם male. 6 6 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם male. 6 13 [אֲנִיכֵם] Uss. אֲנִיכֵם: Potius deesse puto אֲנִיכֵם e chald. 7 15 [אֲנִיכֵם] Poc. אֲנִיכֵם. Uss. אֲנִיכֵם. 7 17 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 8 1 [אֲנִיכֵם] Hebr. אֲנִיכֵם, libris non obstantibus. 8 14 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 8 15 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 8 16 [אֲנִיכֵם] Hebr. postulant אֲנִיכֵם sed libri non juvant. 8 16 [אֲנִיכֵם] fortasse אֲנִיכֵם. 8 33 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 8 36 [אֲנִיכֵם] Poc. אֲנִיכֵם. 9 1 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם male. 9 5 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם pro אֲנִיכֵם. 9 7 [אֲנִיכֵם] Poc. אֲנִיכֵם. 9 8 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 9 9 [אֲנִיכֵם] videtur scribendum אֲנִיכֵם, etsi libri non juvant. 10 3 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 10 4 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 10 15 [אֲנִיכֵם] Poc. אֲנִיכֵם. 10 18 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם. 10 20 [אֲנִיכֵם] nostri, אֲנִיכֵם.

The yield of this collation is negligible. While it is, of course, quite possible that a careful collation of all existing Mss. would help us to correct a number of inferior readings, it seems likely that most corruptions will be found in almost all of them, and that our method of correction cannot be simply that of selecting the best reading of the Mss. Fortunately, we have the original Hebrew text from which S. was translated and we are therefore very frequently in a

position to remedy the mistakes of the S text by a careful comparison with MT and by pointing out how the Syriac which we now have has been corrupted by copyists from a Syriac text which corresponded more closely to MT.

Syriac copyists were just as careless and just as careful as other copyists. They frequently confused letters which looked similar to others. We find, e. g., the following confusions more or less frequently:

l, u.	ϣ, ϣ.
o, u, ϣ, i, e, m, ?.	u, u.
u, u.	ϣ, l, ϣ.
?, i, l, u, l.	u, l.
o, l.	e, o.
l, ?.	e, o.
u, u, u.	i, ?, u, u.
u, ?, u, i, l, u.	e, ϣ.
ϣ, o, u.	l, ?.
u, u.	

Keeping this in mind, I find that the Syriac text should be corrected in the following places:

Proposed Corrections of the Syriac Text.

Ch. I. 8. [ܡܕܝܢܐ] ܡܕܝܢܐ. — 11. [ܡܡܝܪ] ܡܡܝܪ, cf. 5 14 same error.

Ch. 2. 2. [ܡܡܡܐ] ܡܡܡܐ. — 12. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 17. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 18. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 19. [ܡܡܡܐ] ܡܡܡܐ. — 20. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 25. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 30. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 33. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 36. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 40. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 42. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 44. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 47. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 49. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 50. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ. — 51. [ܡܡܝܢ] ܡܡܝܢ.

52. [ܡܫܒܐ] or [ܡܫܒܐ], cf. text. ad. loc. — 53. [ܡܫܒܐ] ܡܫܒܐ. — 54. [ܡܫܒܐ] (?). — 55. [ܡܫܒܐ] ܡܫܒܐ. — 56. [ܡܫܒܐ] ܡܫܒܐ. — 57. [ܡܫܒܐ] ܡܫܒܐ. — 58. [ܡܫܒܐ] ܡܫܒܐ. — 59. [ܡܫܒܐ] ܡܫܒܐ. — 60. [ܡܫܒܐ] ܡܫܒܐ. — 61. [ܡܫܒܐ] ܡܫܒܐ.

Ch. 3. 2. [عَدَلًا] عَادِلًا — 8. هَبْ هَبًّا — 9. مَعْبُدًا مَعْبُودًا
حَسْبُكَ حَسْبًا — II. حَسْبًا حَسْبًا

Ch. 4. 6. سَهْلًا سَهْلًا. — 7. لِيَوْمٍ لِيَوْمٍ, cf. I 8. — 8. مَعَهُ
— 9. فِي فِي, أَتَمَّا أَتَمَّا. — 10. أَتَمَّا أَتَمَّا. —
22. أَتَمَّا أَتَمَّا.

Ch. 5. 3. اعده احرار [اعده] — 16. احدا او احدا (?).

Ch. 6. 2. [مَدِينَة] [وَأَمَّا] — 3. [وَج] [مَدِينَة] — 4. [أَمَّا] [مَدِينَة] (?). — 12. [يَوْمَ] [مَدِينَة] [وَأَمَّا] [وَأَمَّا].

Ch. 7. 2. ~~—~~] —.

[illegible][illegible]

40. [ܡܨܝܬܐ, ܡܨܝܬܐ] — 41. [ܡܨܝܬܐ] — 43. [ܡܨܝܬܐ]

While most of these corrections concern names, there is still a goodly number of other cases where the original reading has been restored. It seems to me quite obvious that the method which Professor Bewer used in his "Text des Buches Ezra" for the Greek versions, must be applied to the Syriac text too and that any editing of S. which simply professes to give the best available text of the Mss. is not a critical edition. We are not left to speculate or to conjecture wildly about a possible text, because we have the Hebrew text from which S. was translated and have therefore a constant check and norm at our disposal. It is, of course, not claimed that every one of the above proposed emendations of S. represents certainly the original Syriac reading, but I believe in most cases it has actually been rediscovered by this method. This, in itself, is an important contribution to the textual history of the Book of Ezra, but it is not the most valuable, because it is even more significant that in our comparison of S. with MT we find a number of places where S. has retained a better reading than MT, in other words, where the *original Hebrew Text* can be restored on the basis of S.

Before giving a list of these, we must make clearer the character of the Peshitta Version of Ezra.

The Syriac translation, as has already been pointed out, is, in the main, carefully made and true to the sense without being slavishly literal. The translator has done exactly as we do in rendering French or German into English. On the other hand, in the forms of the verb, especially in the suffixes, and in the additions and omissions of the copula, a greater freedom is taken than we would like. How far this can be laid at the door of the copyists we cannot say.

In the matter of synonyms for theological ideas and offices an interchange is common; but in no case is the sense of the text injured. In the case of doublets, such as 97 und 1012, the blame must not be laid on the translator. These are more likely marginal references which later copyists put into the text.

As is to be expected in any text that has suffered much at the hands of copyists, there are many words omitted. The omissions, however, are of an unimportant nature. They consist mostly of particles, the copula, words not understood, and certain words in paraphrastic phrases. Omissions occur in: 11, 2, 6; 231, 68, 69; 313; 43, 5, 10, 13, 14, 17, 22; 57, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17; 61, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 20, 21; 71, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 24, 28; 83, 6, 15, 20, 26, 27; 96, 8; 109, 14, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 43.

There is also a large number of additions. These, as in the case of the omissions, are of an unimportant character and are due to the copyists. By far the largest number of the omissions and additions are those of the copula. The translator has also a fondness for adding the obvious, *e. g.*, when a person is referred to in MT by name only, the S. translator adds, in nearly every case the title of his office, *e. g.*, Ezra (the scribe or priest), etc. Additions occur in: 11, 2, 6, 7, 10, 11; 21, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28, 31, 33, 36, 37, 41, 42, 58, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67; 38, 9, 10, 12; 42, 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 15, 17, 19, 23; 53, 8, 11, 14, 17; 63, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21; 71, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 27; 81, 17, 19, 26, 30; 91, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 15; 102, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 30, 35, 41, 42.

Variants in the Divine name commonly occur. The translator invariably renders יהוה by יהוה in keeping with Jewish tradition. Occasionally אלהים is also rendered by יהוה *e. g.* 15; 38, 9; 622; 715; 101, 6, 9.

Words are sometimes misunderstood. Several words from the Persian occur in Ezra. These the translator has not always understood as is shown by the following: **אספרנא** which S. has as follows: 5 8 **אספרא**; cf. note *ad loc.* 6 8 omits; 6 12 **חייא** "quickly"; 7 21 **עמלמא** "zealously"; 7 17, 26 **רעמא** "carefully". **התרשתא**, the designation of the Persian Governor of Judea in Ezra 2 63 is given as **רעמא**. Cf. note *ad loc.* In Ezra 4 13, 20; 7 24 is a list of the terms used for toll and customs. The translator misunderstood these terms and rendered as follows: 4 13, MT "tribute, custom, toll" by a paraphrase "there will be no tribute for thee". 4 20: Here the translator departs yet farther from MT, paraphrasing the original "and tribute, toll, and custom was paid them" by "and for the former kings they had no regard at all." 7 24, MT reads, "Tribute, custom, and toll it is not lawful to levy on them" by "it is not lawful to say a thing to them." In 4 8, 5 4, and 6 13 occurs the word **כנמא** which the translator mistook and translated by **נעמא** except in 5 9, 11, where the word occurs again it is correctly rendered. In 4 13 the word **אפתם** "impost" (reading with many Mss. **אפתם**) is incorrectly translated by **אפא** "also she".

As to the k'thib and k're the translator used his own judgment as to the better reading but preferred the k're to the k'thib. Out of a total of 28 cases, the translator uses the k're 17 times, the k'thib 6 times and follows his own judgment 5 times. The list follows:

K'thib	K're	Syriac
2 1 נבוכדנצור	נבוכדנצור	ܢܒܫܕܢܥܘܪ = k're.
2 46 שמלי	שלמי	ܫܠܡܝ = k're.
2 50 נפסים	נפוסים	ܢܦܫܝܡ = k're.
3 3 ויעל	ויעלו	ܘܝܥܠܘ = k're.

	K'thib	K're	Syriac
4 2	ולא	ולו	ܘܠܐ = k're.
4 4	ומבלהים	ומבהלים	ܘܡܒܠܗܝܡ = k'thib.
4 7	כנותו	כנותיו	ܟܢܘܬܐ = k'thib.
4 9	ארכוי	ארכויא	ܐܪܚܝܐ S. here follows neither k'thib nor k're but reads independently ארכיא which a later scribe has carelessly written ארכיא. Torrey suggests this reading ¹ but gives no credit to the Peshitta.

4 9	דהוא	דהיא	ܕܗܐ = k're.
4 11	עבדיך	עבדך	ܥܒܕܝܚܝܐ = k'thib.
5 1	נביאה	נביא	ܢܒܝܐ = k're.
5 12	כסדיא	כסדאה	ܟܣܕܐ = k're.
6 14	נביאה	נביא	ܢܒܝܐ = k're.
6 17	לחטיא	לחטאה	ܠܚܬܝܐ = independent.
7 18	עליך	עלך	ܥܠܝܐ = k're.
	אחיד	אחך	ܐܚܝܐ = k'thib.
7 25	דינין	דינין	ܕܝܢܝܐ = k're.
7 26	S. paraphrases and reads independently.		
8 13	יעואל	יעיאל	ܝܥܝܐܠ S. read originally k're. A copyist has confused ܝ and ܝܐ.

8 14	זבור	זכור	ܙܥܘܪ = k're.
8 17	S. paraphrases but follows k're <i>ad sensum</i> .		
10 2	עולם	עילם	ܥܝܠܡ = k're.
10 12	כדברך	כדברך	ܟܕܒܪܝܚܝܐ = k'thib.
10 29	ירמות	ורמות	ܝܪܡܘܬ = k'thib.
10 35	כלוהי	כלוהו	ܟܠܘܝܐ = independent.
10 37	ויעשו	ויעשי	ܘܝܥܫܐ = k're originally.
10 43	ידו	ידי	S. omits.
10 44	נשאי	נשאו	ܢܫܥܐ = k're.

This proves that the translator knew the traditional reading of the synagogue but by no means felt bound by

¹ Cf. *Ezra Studies*, ad loc.

that system. No decisive argument can be deduced from the above to prove that the translator was a Jew; a Christian would have known the *k're* corrections as well as a Jew.

Differences in vocalization frequently occur. The majority of these instances are confined to proper names. All these cases are fully discussed in the text further on.

Free paraphrases occur in every chapter. These are in some instances due to foreign words, the meaning of which the translator did not know. In the second place, the translator shows a predilection to add explanatory words, such as priest, prophet, etc. In the third case, paraphrases explain what would otherwise be unintelligible to the translator's readers. G. misunderstood some of these passages in the original and nothing, it would seem, shows so clearly the independence of S. over G as 263: MT כהן *כהן* (cf. Neh. 765). S. paraphrases by *כֹּהֵן זָבֵחַ* *כֹּהֵן זָבֵחַ*, while G^{AB} translates with an attempt at extreme literalness *ιερεὺς τοῖς φωτίζουσιν καὶ τελείοις* which makes no sense. G^{AB} wrongly connects *אורים* and *תמים* with *אור* and *תם*. The Peshitta translator understood the meaning. First, there is the addition of *זבל* to *כֹּהֵן* (cf. Ex. 2830, Lev. 818, Num. 2721) which shows historical accuracy and also is in keeping with the translator's habit of adding explanatory words. In the second place, he paraphrases correctly the meaning of *לֵאמֹר וְלֵאמֹר*. If the Peshitta translation of Ezra had been made under the influence of G, should we not expect its influence to be seen in a difficult passage such as this?

Another passage of the same order is 94 where *מנחת הערב* is translated by *חֲבִיטָה מִצֵּי*. Here again G^{AB} follows MT literally with *τῆς θυσίας τῆς ἑσπερινῆς*. The translator of the Peshitta, however, with historical accuracy, renders "until

the ninth hour", *i. g.*, the hour of prayer, which, in the times, when there was no temple, and so no *minḥah*, took the place of the evening sacrifice¹. The translator, exactly as in 263, has not literally rendered words which might be misunderstood or meaningless but by his paraphrase has made the passage perfectly intelligible to his readers.

Another instance occurs in 101. MT has here "and the people wept"; the translator has paraphrased this as "the children wept" which seemed to him to be the true meaning of the original.

While these instances show the freedom of the translator, they by no means prove that the Peshitta is a mere paraphrase. Moreover, in none of these illustrations is there the slightest dependence on G. These passages and a few similar ones that occur in the translation are fully discussed in the comparison of the text with MT.

It is manifest that the Syriac translator has succeeded, on the whole, remarkably well in presenting the Book of Ezra in a good Syriac dress to his countrymen and that it could thus take its place appropriately in the Syriac Bible.

For the Biblical scholar, however, and especially for the textual critic, the greatest value of the Peshitta of Ezra lies in the fact that it has in forty-two instances preserved the original reading, and therefore it must be employed to reconstruct the Hebrew text of the Massorites. These original readings are as follows:

16 ܠܒܪ ܠܒ = ܠܒ = "very much" which is undoubtedly the original reading.

225 ܠܩܪܝܬ ܥܪܝܡ ܠܩܪܝܬ ܥܪܝܡ which was originally ܠܥܪܝܡ = ܠܥܪܝܡ. A scribe has carelessly written ܐ for ܐ both here and in Neh. 7 29. S. represents here (in the original)

¹ Duhm, *Die Psalmen*, to Ps. 141 2. Cf. also *Acts*, 3 1.

the correct reading. MT is due to carelessness. GAB and Neh. 7 29 both bear witness with S. that MT must be corrected.

3 4 עלת עלת S. here with G and several Heb. mss. has preserved the plural and MT must be corrected accordingly.

3 9 יהודה יהודה = יהודה. As 2 40 shows, S. has here preserved the correct form of this name.

3 10 ויעמדו ויעמדו S. agrees with several Heb. Mss. and G, and undoubtedly represents the original.

3 12 חבול חבול חבול חבול S. alone of all the versions has here preserved the original reading, viz. "this house in its great honor". MT has lost the words "in its great honor", and must be corrected by supplying הרב בקברו.

ובשמחה ובשמחה S. reads the copula, as does Esd., which is the correct reading. MT must be changed to ובשמחה.

4 3 המלך המלך המלך S. omits המלך (G and Esd. also). MT should be corrected accordingly, since "King Cyrus, King of Persia" is evidently redundant.

4 10 בקרית בקרית S. reads "in the cities of the province of Samaria". This (cf. 2 Kgs. 17 24) is also G's reading and is preferable to MT's "in the city".

4 23 רחום רחום + רחום S. and GL alone preserve the original text. The title בעל-טעם must be inserted in the Hebrew. Cf. vss. 8, 9, 17.

5 1 נביא נביא S. has quite grammatically "Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo the prophet." This is certainly better than MT and it may represent the original text. The alternative is to follow Esd. in omitting נביא after נביא.

5 4 אמר אמר S. and G have preserved here the original text. MT must be emended to read אמר.

8 12 **עשרה** **חשביה**. S. reads with 38 Heb. mss. and Esd.^L what is undoubtedly the original. MT should be emended accordingly to **עשרים**.

8 24 **חשביה** **חשביה**. S. with Esd.^{AB} has preserved the original reading because Hashabia was not a priest but a Levite according to vs. 18.

8 34 **במשקל** **במשקל**. The copula must be inserted in MT to read **ובמשקל** with S.

9 1 **כתעבתיהם** **כתעבתיהם** = **כתעבתיהם**, so also G and this was most probably the original reading. So Bewer.

9 3 **בנגי** **בנגי**. MT must be emended to read **בנגי** with S. instead of sing.

9 4 **בדבר** **בדבר** = **בדבר**. The reading in S. is vouched for by G, Esd., and Vulg. and doubtlessly represents the original reading. Cf. Bewer *ad loc.*

9 12 **עולם** **עולם** = **עולם** = **k're** of MT which is preferable to MT **kethib**. This reading is vouched for by G, Esd.^L and Vulg.

10 5 **הלוים** **הלוים**. S. reads "priests and Levites" = **הלוים** MT should be corrected accordingly.

10 6 **וילן** **וילן** = **וילן**. A scribe has carelessly written **וילן** for **וילן** in MT. S. preserves the original reading. (Esd. also.)

10 7 **ויירושלם** **ויירושלם**. S. here has preserved the original which is vouched for by many Heb. Mss. and also by G. The context also demands it in agreement with the previous "in Judea".

10 14 **עד** **עד**. MT must be emended to read **עד** for **עד** according to the more original reading of S.

10 16 **ויבדלו** **ויבדלו**. S. (cf. also G) gives evidence of an original **ויבדלו** which MT demands as Ezra is subject of the sentence. MT reads plural; but this must be emended.

10 16 **לדרוש** **לדרוש** = **לדרוש**. This is the correct reading. MT must be accordingly corrected.

10 17 **האנשים** **חבא** **מלכא**. MT must be emended to read **האנשים**.

10 20 **ובניה** **אמל**. S. and 9 Heb. Mss. may well represent the original.

10 31 **ב חב סמ** **ובני תרם**. GAB and many Heb. mss. agree with S. in this reading which is doubtless original. MT must be corrected to read **ובני**. GAB, Esd.ALB vocalize **תרם** as does S. MT must also be corrected to read with S.

10 34 **בני** **חב**. Cf. vs. 29 where the "sons of Bani" are already listed. S. must be correct, as one clan would not be listed twice. MT must accordingly be corrected to read **בני**.

אואל **א** **א** = **אואל** to which Esd.ABL and GLB also testify. MT must be accordingly corrected.

10 35 **כלהו** **מלכא** = **כלהו** **כלהו** which may have preserved the original reading.

10 38 **ובני** **ובני** **ובני** **ובני**. S., in spite of a scribal corruption, has preserved the original reading **ובני**, *i. e.* "the sons of Binnui". So also G. MT must be accordingly corrected to **ובני**.

CHAPTER I

1. [ירמיה +]ܢܚܠ. Cf. also 1 2, 7. The translator of Ezra adds such explanatory words. Cf. the parallel in 2 Chr. 36 22 where the same addition is made.

ܦܠܓܝܢܐ [ܡܦܝ] is a free translation. S. supports MT over against ܒܦܝ of Esd. and GL. In the duplicate section, 2 Chr. 36 22, ܒܦܝ = ܢܚܠ.

[ܐܪܥܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܦܪܝܫ]. S. omits. ܐܪܥܐ here, either by accident or by oversight of a copyist.

2. ܡܠܟܐ [ܐܪܥܐ ܡܠܟܐ]. The translator or a copyist may have omitted accidentally both ܐܪܥܐ and the s'jāmē points of ܡܠܟܐ. But it is also possible that ܐܪܥܐ seemed superfluous to the translator, because he took the Hebrew to mean "the rule of the earth". In any case we need not assume that the translator had a Hebrew original different from the MT.

[ܐܪܥܐ ܡܠܟܐ] + ܡܠܟܐ. Cf. note on vs. 1.

3. ܐܪܥܐ ܡܠܟܐ [ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ]. As in 2 Chr. 36 23 the duplicate section.

ܐܪܥܐ [ܐܪܥܐ].

4. ܐܪܥܐ [ܐܪܥܐ ܡܠܟܐ]. This is a very literal translation which does not represent the true meaning of the Hebrew here which is to "help". G also did not know this meaning, translating ληψονταί.

5. ܐܪܥܐ [ܐܪܥܐ].

ܐܪܥܐ [ܐܪܥܐ]. The translator took the relative ܐܪܥܐ to

refer to יהוה and translated "a house for the Lord יהוה *the God who* is in Jerusalem". Taking יהוה as a proper name, his addition, the God, was appropriate and quite in accordance with his habit (cf. note on I 1). MT reads: "the house of יהוה which is in Jerusalem."

6. אִשֶּׁה [חֻקּוֹ]. S. renders freely, due perhaps to בִּידֵיהֶם.

וְיָסַח [בֹּהֶב] etc. The translator does not repeat the preposition governing two nouns in succession as the Syriac style does not require such a repetition.

וְלִבְר. MT here is evidently corrupt. S. (also Esd.) reads „very much” which is doubtless the original reading.

וְאֵלֶּה [עַל-כִּלְהֵתְנֵדָב]. S. understood הַתְּנִדָּב as referring to the persons who gave freely and translated accordingly. MT took it as referring to the gifts which were given to the temple (in accordance with vs. 4) and its meaning is "in addition (על) to all that had been freely given" (to the temple). S's original apparently did not have כָּל, it was neither in G nor in Esd.^L and must therefore have been omitted in the Hebrew mss. (accidentally through haplography). That it was in the older texts is clear not only from MT but from Esd.^{AB}. Cf. Bewer, *Text des Buches Ezra*, S. 14.

7. וְנִבְכַּדְנָזַר + וְחַבְבַּי [חַבְבַּי]. Cf. note on vs. 1.

8. וְיָסַח [מִתְרַדָּת]. It is quite apparent that this reading is not due to the original translator who wrote וְיָסַח but to a careless copyist who mistook ל for ו.

וְיָסַח [שֶׁשְׁבָעַר]. This also must not be put to the account of the translator who wrote וְיָסַח but to that of a careless scribe who wrote this incorrectly and fixed the wrong form in his mind, for he makes the same mistake in I 11, 5 14.

9. וְאֵלֶּה [אֶנְרַטְלִי]. S. interprets as meaning "bowls". מִחֲלָפִים [חֲלָף]. The translator connected the word with חֲלָף *change*.

Cf. חליפה *garment for changing*. The Vulg. renders *cultri* and Esd. θύματα ἀργυρεῖ.

10. Apparently the translator had omitted the gold bowls first; then he noticed his mistake and added them with **כל**.

כלים + **ו**. The addition of the copula, although of no critical significance, is noted. (Cf. discussion of these additions and omissions in the Introduction.)

11. **ממנו**; **ששבער**. Cf. note on vs. 8.

ממנו; **שלמה** **ו** **חב** **הגולה** **מבבל**. The addition of **שלמה** is simply in the interest of a good translation.

CHAPTER II

1. **משבי הגולה** [ܡܫܒܝ ܗܓܠܬܐ]. The translator probably regarded **הגולה** as superfluous and, accordingly, left it untranslated. Cf. Neh. 7 6 where both words are literally rendered as in MT.

ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ . . . **ܠܒܒܠ**. S. freely renders MT's „carried into exile—to Babylon”, by “which he carried into exile—and brought them to Babylon”. Neh. 7 6 translates MT literally as above.

ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ . . . **ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ**. This is a similar free translation.

2. **ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ**. This is the regular Syriac vocalization in Ezra, Neh., Hag, and Zech.

ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ. This is due to a different vocalization.

ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ. The translator misunderstood this name and incorrectly translated it “number”.

ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ. S. avoids the tautological expression of MT by omitting **עם**. In Neh. 7 7, however, S. translates it verbatim.

6. **ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ** in Ezra. S. always translates **פחת** as if it were a noun. (Neh. 7 11 idem.) The translator of Hag. 1 1, 2 22 renders it by **ܚܬ**, taking it as did the translator of Ezra. The term **had**, by this time, become a proper name.

ܡܫܒܝܐܢܐ ܕܢܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܠ. S. disregards the **ל** = “namely” (cf. 1 5) and continues the catalogue noting each as a separate clan.

2. **וַיִּזְכֹּר**. S correctly renders **וַיִּזְכֹּר**. Neh. 7, and Esd. also vouch for the reading in S.

8. **וַיִּזְכֹּר**. The difference in the vocalization is probably due to the omission of the *mater lectionis* in the Ms. which the translator used.

10. **שֵׁשׁ** was omitted by a careless scribe.

12. **עֲזָנָה**. This is evidently a scribal corruption for **חֲזָנָה**. Cf. Neh. 7 17.

13. **אֲדַנִּיקָם**. This is the usual Syriac transcription. Neh. 7 17 and Ezra 8 13 **אֲדַנִּיקָם** is a scribal corruption for **אֲדַנִּיקָם**.

15. **עֲדִין**. This is the same as in Neh. 7 20. Cf. note on 28.

17. **חֲמִשִּׁים**. This mistake was probably occasioned by the figure in the preceding verse.

16. **לִיחֻזְקָה**. This is without ' preformative as MT Neh. 7 21.

17. **בְּנֵי**. This is a copyist's mistake for the original **בְּנֵי** as in Neh. 7 23.

18. **יִזְרָה**. Misled by a confusion of **י** and **י**, a scribe thought the well known **יִזְרָה** was meant and wrote accordingly. There is no reason to think that this corresponded to a different Heb. original.

19. **חֲשֵׁם**. Note the different vocalization. Neh. 7 22 is a scribal error for **חֲשֵׁם**.

20. **נִבְרָה** is partly due to the confusion of **י** and **י** and partly to the careless omission of **ב**. As in 2 18 it is not necessary to hypothecate a different Heb. original.

22. **נִמְלָה**. This vocalization, as in Neh. 7 26 is due to the absence of the *mater lectionis* in the translator's Heb. Ms.

25. **נִבְרָה**. This was originally **נִבְרָה**. A scribe has carelessly written **נ** for **ב** both here and in Neh. 7 29.

S, presents here (in the original) the correct reading. MT's reading is due to carelessness. GAB and Neh. 7 29 both bear witness with 2 25 that MT must here be corrected.

[ובארות שבע]. The printed Syriac texts here have a wrong division of these words as ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ which were originally, of course, ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ as Neh. 7 29. Thorndyke's Mss. read this also.

26. ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. This is a scribal error due to the preceding verse. Cf. vss. 10, 15, and Neh. 7 30.

28. ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. S. omits the article in proper names as do the English versions.

30. ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. This is due to a scribal confusion of ܐ and ܝ.

31. ܫܒܥܐ. S. omits.

33. ܫܒܥܐ. This mistake of ܝ and ܝ is due to a copyist.

ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. This is as Neh. 7 37; the difference is due to a copyist.

37. ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. S. writes as in 7 40 with different vocalization, but in 1. Chr. 9 12, 24 14, ܫܒܥܐ.

ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ + ܫܒܥܐ. This addition is due to the influence of the following verse.

38. ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ ܫܒܥܐ. This is due to carelessness.

39. ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. S. writes with a different vocalization. Cf. vss. 15, 22, 30.

40. ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. The omission of ܐ here is due to the carelessness of a scribe. In Neh. 7 43 this word is correctly written.

ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. Both MT and S. are here corrupt. The original Heb. had the proper name ܫܒܥܐ. Cf. vs. 6.

ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ = ܫܒܥܐ. S. agrees here with the k're of Neh. 7 43. (So also in 3 9.)

41. ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ = ܫܒܥܐ ܐܪܬܐ. MT is correct.

42. **לחל** [השערים]. This is a copyist's error for **לחל**. Cf. vs. 40 for opposite mistake in writing final **ל**. The translator took this word for a proper name. This accounts for the addition of the copula to the following **חל**.

חל [שלמן]. This is due to a copyist's interchanging of letters.

חל [עקוב]. As in Neh. 7 45, the copyist's error is due to dittography. The mistake was easily made, as **יעקוב** is a more familiar name than **עקוב**.

חל [חמיטא]. S. writes the word with different vocalization.

43. **חל** [ציהא]. This is evidently a copyist's error for the original **חל** as in careless writing they look so much alike. Cf. Neh. 7 45 where **חל** occurs.

חל [חשופא]. S. writes with a different vocalization. Cf. 2 42. The confusion of **ח** and **פ** is due to a copyist.

44. **חל** [סיעהא]. This is a copyist's error for the original **חל**.

חל [קרם]. This is the result of a copyist's confusion of **ח** and **י**.

חל [פרון]. This is the result of a copyist's confusion of **ח** and **י**.

45. **חל** [לבנה]. This is evidently a copyist's error for the original **חל** and is due to a confusion of **ח** and **י**.

חל [עקוב]. Cf. vs. 42 for the same confusion of **ח** and **פ**.

46. **חל** [שמלי]. So also MT *k're* and Neh. 7 48.

47. **חל** [גדל]. This is the result of copyist's confusion of **ח** and **י**.

חל [גתר]. As in Neh. 7 49, this transposition of consonants is due to a copyist.

חל [ראיה]. This is due to a copyist's confusion of **ח** and **י**. Cf. the worse confusion in Neh. 7 50, **חל** for **חל**.

48. **חל** [רצין]. As in Neh. 7 50, the **ח** is a copyist's error, but the punctuation is truly Aramaic.

יְהוֹאָהָ [יְהוֹאָהָ]. Here is a confusion of י and ה, as well as of א and ב, with a good Semitic name as the result. In Neh. 7 50 the name appears as יְהוֹאָהָ.

49. פֶּסַח [פֶּסַח]. This is due to a confusion of פ with ל.

יְהוֹאָהָ [יְהוֹאָהָ]. This is due to a confusion of י with א.

50. אֶסְנָה [אֶסְנָה]. This is due to a confusion of א with א.

מַעֲוִיָּה [מַעֲוִיָּה]. This is due to a confusion of מ with א.

נְפִיסִים [נְפִיסִים]. S. reads as does MT קִרֵּי.

51. תְּרַחֲוֹר [תְּרַחֲוֹר]. This is due to a confusion of ת with י. Cf. Neh. 7 53 where תְּרַחֲוֹר is due to an aural error.

52. מַחֲזִירָא [מַחֲזִירָא]. This is probably due to a confusion of י with י; but several Heb. mss. read מַחֲזִירָא both here and in Neh. 7 54.

53. בְּרִקְסִים [בְּרִקְסִים]. This is due to a confusion of ב with א.

תַּמַּח [תַּמַּח]. As in Neh. 7 56, this is due to the careless writing of a scribe.

54. חֲטִיפָא [חֲטִיפָא]. This is due to a different vocalization which GB also has.

55. עֲבָרִי [עֲבָרִי]. This is due to the omission of א and the confusion of י with י.

חַטָּה [חַטָּה]. The חַטָּה is a mistake. The translator took חַטָּה and חַטָּה as two names as in vs. 58. Neh. 7 60 S. = MT. = חַטָּה חַטָּה.

חַטָּה [חַטָּה]. The ח is due to the preceding חַטָּה.

חַטָּה [חַטָּה]. This is due to a different vocalization.

56. יַעֲלָה [יַעֲלָה]. The י is omitted by haplography as in Neh. 7 58 and חַטָּה חַטָּה comes from vs. 57.

יַעֲלָה [יַעֲלָה]. The י is a copyist's error for י.

57. בְּנֵי שְׁפִטָּה [בְּנֵי שְׁפִטָּה] is omitted here and transposed to vs. 56.

חַטָּה [חַטָּה]. This is due to a different vocalization.

חַטָּה [חַטָּה]. This is due to a confusion of ח and א and to a different vocalization.

חַטָּה [חַטָּה]. The translator took חַטָּה not as a name

but as a noun and wrongly connected it with צבא whose plural is צבאות. Neh. 7 59 חַבִּי נֶסֶב; GB υιοι Ἀσβεβαιν; GA omits and reads: υιοι, and as usual translates literally.

אמר is a copyist's error for original אמר.

58. חב סעלמ [עבדי שלמה]. Cf. note on vs. 55. The translator wrongly takes as two separate names.

59. תל מלח [חבסב]. This is due to a transposition of consonants.

חבסב [תל חרשא]. The translator mistook these words and prefixed ח = place to which; then took חרשא as the Aramaic word חרשא for "forest" = חב, together making חבסב to "Tel-'Aba". Evidently the translator knew nothing of the geography of this region.

סחסב [כרוב]. Again the translator takes this as a place to which and prefixed ח as well as the copula "and". He reads a different vocalization and a scribe has added ח making what, to him, was a familiar name.

[ומבני אדן] ("from) Addan, Immer"] [אמר] "then it was reported". As in Neh. 7 61, S. takes these names for a clause. The mistake was easy to make as the translator thought in Aramaic and when his eye caught these words he carelessly translated as above. Cf. his careless translation of מספר in vs. 2.

אם [אל א]. S. translates MT's "whether" by "except that (they were of Israel)." In MT it is questionable whether these Exiles were of the stock of Israel; in S. the only question is their ability to show a certificate of birth.

60. נקודה [חב]. This is due to a scribe's confusion of ח and ח; and to a different vocalization.

61. [ומבני הכהנים]. S. omits.

מסב [הקוין]. A copyist has carelessly transposed the consonants.

62. מנצא = חבסב [נמצא].

חבבא יהבאש [כתבם המתחשים]. Here are free but good translations, and, in no way, presuppose a different Hebrew original.

63. התירשאת אש אש אש. This is an unsuccessful attempt to explain a Persian word (tiršatha) which the translator did not know. More than 700 years intervened between Ezra and the translator and the Persian terms for office were entirely unknown to him. The plural form of the verb is necessitated by אש. Cf. Neh. 7 65 where this word is rendered מפגל מפגל.

כהן כהן כהן. Here, as in Esd., "the high priest" is an interpretative translation.

אש אש אש אש [לאורים ולתומים] "and he shall inquire and determine (lit. see)". Here a paraphrase of the terms Urim and Thummim is given by the translator as the original significance of these terms was unknown to the popular reader.

65. MT ולהם משררים ומשרות "and their singers male and female". S. אש אש אש אש "and their servants who were serving them" This mistake arose from the similarity of the words משררים and משרתים.

68. התנדבו לבית האלהים להעמידו על-מקומו = they gave free will offerings for the house of God to establish it upon its site. S. אש אש אש אש אש אש אש אש = they planned together for the house of the Lord; and then rose up and did bravely. S. paraphrases here but not correctly.

האלהים אש Cf. I 5, 3 8, 9.

69. דרכמונים אש. S. gives the Persian equivalent.

שש אש is less usual than אש.

אש. S. omits אש before אש.

70. אש אש. The *matres lectionis* not appearing in the ms., our translator read אש; then he added אש to the words "singers and porters".

בְּעִרְיָהֶם [בְּעִרְיָהֶם]. The • is evidently a mistake for ב.

+ [בְּעִרְיָהֶם; בְּעִרְיָהֶם]. A comparison of MT und S. shows in translation the following:

MT.

"The priests and levites,
and (the rest) of the people,
and the singers, and porters
and the Nethinim dwelt in
their cities, even all Israel
in their cities."¹

S.

"So the priests and levites and
a part of the people and part
of the servants and part of the
porters and the Nethinim and
those who were dwelling in
their cities returned; and all
Israel *in their cities.*"¹

MT is certainly corrupt as it stands. S. tried to remedy the reading with the above result.

¹ Dittography. (S. corrected as above.)

CHAPTER III

1. **למסעם אל ירושלים**. MT has the people already at Jerusalem. In S. the people gather at some undefined place "to go up to Jerusalem". This does not imply that S. had a Heb. original different from that of our MT. S. presents here simply a paraphrastic element in the translation.

2. **מבוא** [שאלתיאל]. S's reading is a copyist's mistake for **מבוא**. Cf. 3 8, 5 2 for a similar error.

נביא [איש האלהים]. As in I Chr. 23 14 und II Chr. 30 16 S. renders the MT "man of God" by "prophet of God". Cf. Dt. 33 1 und Jos. 14 6 where the same phrase is rendered in S. by **נביא**.

3. **סללם** [ויכינו המזבח]. S. translated freely by a passive.

יסלל [באימה]. S. brings out the force of the strong **אמה** but disregards the preposition **ב**.

בנין [הארצות]. S. gives a correct paraphrastic translation.

חבב [עלות לבקר]. S. has the singular; but whether this is due to the translator or to a copyist who altered the pl. **חבב** by carelessly copying, we do not know.

4. **עלת**. Cf. vs. 3. Here S., the Greek versions and several Heb. mss. have the plural. This seems to be preferable.

6. **חבב** [עלות]. Cf. on vs. 3.

חֲבֵרָה לְמִסְדָּה לְאֵל יִסֵּד. Mt represents the temple as not yet begun, "the foundation was not laid;" S. represents the work as "not yet completed".

7. לצדנים ולצרים | *לצדנים ולצרים*. S. transposes the order.

ܚܒܠ ܕܒܝܐ ܐܠ ܝܫܐ. S. translates "by the sea to Joppa"
 freely but well. Cf. II Chr. 2 15.

8. האלהים. מַלְאָכָא. Cf. 15, 268.

Cf. I 3, 4. ירושלם | לירושלם

ܝܚܠܐ. S. is obviously an error for the original ܝܚܠܐ = MT. The ܝ was confused with ܝ and then to make a Syriac word ܝܚܠܐ was added.

ספספ. The addition of • is due to a misunderstanding of S.

לְנֶצַח. In rendering the Mt “to superintend” by “to be by the day”, the translator wrongly reads לְנֶצַח which, in the unpointed text, was written with the same radicals, viz: לְנֶצַח “in perpetuo”, “daily”.

9. בְּנֵי וְאֶחָיו. S. changes the order as in vs. 7.

סממל [קדמאל. This is due to a careless scribe who omitted the final $\aleph$ as in 240.

סח.א. [בני יהודה] S. has preserved this name better than MT. Cf. 2⁴⁰.

S. translates MT "to superintend the doing (of the work)" by "who were doing" because of his misunderstanding לנצה in vs. 8.

י. חסד. בבית. This is merely a free translation.

Cf. I 5, 2 68, 3 8. [האלהים]

אחרי. The confusion of , and ; is due to a copyist; but the interchange of ה and ח doubtless goes back to the translator.

10. **בְּחִלּוֹת הַבְּנִיִּים**. The MT "the builders" is rendered in S. "of the building". This is not correct. One might think

the original read **חָלַל** = MT; but this would involve the change of position of **חָלַל** which should come directly after **וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ**.

וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ. S. translates MT "and they stationed" by "and they rose up". S's reading (**וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ**) agrees with several Heb. Mss. as well as with the Greek versions and doubtlessly represents the original.

וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ. S. here freely renders MT's "with trumpets" by "and holding rams' horns and blowing them".

בְּמִצְלִיִּם. S. renders the MT's "with trumpets" by "with cymbals". But S. hardly had a different Heb. original. Cf. preceding note.

II. **וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ**. S. renders freely but well.

וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ. This is a mistake in Lee's text for **וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ** (Walton).

וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ. True to the idea expressed in vs. 6, MT's laying of the foundation of the temple is S's "completion" of the same.

12. **וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ**. S. carelessly omits the copula.

וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ. S. renders MT's "the first house, when its foundation was laid" by "this house in its great former honor" (= **וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ**); and probably has alone of all the versions preserved an original reading. Cf. Bewer p. 46.

וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ. Cf. vs. 11.

וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ. S. reads the copula with Esd. which is the correct reading. MT should be changed to read **וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ** accordingly.

13. **וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ**. This is omitted by S. through oversight.

והקול ^ההוא. Cf. translation of MT and S. following:

MT

S.

"And the people could not distinguish the sound of the shout of joy from the sound of the people's weeping; because the people were shouting a great shout and the sound was heard for a long distance."

"And the people could not hear the sound of the trumpets, because the people were blowing the trumpets with a loud noise, and the sound of weeping was heard for a long distance."

Both MT and S. are confused because the Hebrew is corrupt.

CHAPTER IV

2. **נבנה** **אף** **נבנה**. S. brings out the meaning freely but correctly by rendering "we also will build".

נדרוש. S. repeats "we will build"; but this a copyist's error for **נבנה** = **נדרוש**.

אנחנו **נבנה** **אנחנו** **נבנה**. S. had the same reading as K'rê, i. e. **אנחנו** and freely and pointedly adds "here," evidently meaning these "enemies" also had been in the habit of worshipping Jahweh at Jerusalem.

סנחריב **אסרחדון**. This reading of "Sennacherib" for "Esarhaddon" by no means makes the presupposition of a different underlying text necessary. Sennacherib, the father of Esarhaddon, was more familiar to the translator than his son, and the misreading may therefore have been quite accidental.

3. **אנחנו**. S. freely adds. Cf. note on 11.

המלך. S. omits as does G. and Esd.: MT should be corrected accordingly; for "king Cyrus king of Persia" is evidently redundant.

4. **אנחנו** **אנחנו** **אנחנו**. The MT "people of the land", i. e. common people, seems always to denote a contrast with Israel, "the chosen people". Originally the phrase meant the native races of Palestine and later the heathen. The irony of MT is lost by S. which freely renders "peoples". Cf. 34 where this phrase is also paraphrased. 91 shows

clearly the significance of the phrase as meaning "heathen"; S. here renders "people of the provinces" which brings out the exact meaning.

לכנות [לא חסד]. This is a free but good translation.

5. חסדתא [יועצים]. This is evidently a copyist's error in S. for the original חסדתא = יועצים. Thorndyke in Walton suggests חסדתא.

ועד [חמל], without the copula.

6. אסעבד חמל [אחשורוש]. Cf. note on 11.

7. סהל [שטנה]. In the sense of accusation סהל does not occur elsewhere. It is therefore most likely that the translator wrote סהל = MT which a copyist corrupted to סהל.

7. סהל חמל [בשלם]. S. completely misunderstood this name and took it as the noun חמל with the preposition ח standing pregnantly for חל חמל = *he saluted*.

8. חמל [מתרדת]. The confusion of ח and ח, and is due to a scribe. Cf. 18 where the same error occurs.

8. The section from 48–618 is in Aramaic.

9. חמל [טעם] which in 49, 17, 23 is written חמל but in each instance appears to be a mistake for חמל which we must read in all cases. (So also Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 1431). In view of the persistent mistake it may, however, be suggested that חמל is really τάρμα, although this is ordinarily written חמל. In 418 טעם is translated by חמל = διάταγμα.

10. חמל [שמשי]. Without the final yodh occurs also in 49, 17, 23.

11. חמל [כנמא]. This is a wrong translation which connects חמל with נמא.

12. חמל [ואפרסתכיא]. The nature of the officials represented by MT is uncertain. S. gives an interpretation. Marquart (cf. notes in Bertholet's "Esra und Nehemia" p. 15) argues for S's reading (ספריא).

מִרְפָּלִיא stands for the original מִרְפָּלִיא. A scribe has omitted the ׀.

אִזְחֵל [אִזְחֵל]. This shows a confusion of ׀ and ׀.

רְדִיָּא = K'rê רְדִיָּא [רְדִיָּא].

10. אִסְנַפֵּר [אִסְנַפֵּר]. This is due to a confusion of ׀ and ׀; and the transposition of the ׀ corrupted to ׀; originally it was אִסְנַפֵּר.

חֲמִשָּׁל [בְּקָרִיָּה]. S. reads "in the cities of (the province of) Samaria". Cf. II. Kings 17 24. This is better than MT. G = S.

וְשֹׁאֵר. S. omits.

סֹאמַחֵ [וְכַעֲנַת]. This transliteration shows that the translator did not understand this word which the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine show was the regular particle (also written כַּעַת and כַּעַן) to introduce the matter of a letter after the greeting. It should be translated "to proceed" or "further". Obviously it did not originally occur in this verse; as it stands, it is a copyist's mistake brought in from the following verse (cf. Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr* under סֹאמַחֵ col. 1790: "Pro כַּעַת I. Esd IV. 10, 11 extat in Polygl. סֹאמַחֵ, sed codd. Poc. et Uss. in V. 10 exhibent סֹאמַחֵ, in v. 11 סֹאמַחֵ. Valet voc. Chald. כַּעַת sic, ita, et caetera, sed pro nom. prop. habuisse videtur Syrus.") Both MT and S. must be corrected by omitting this word. Cf. Vulg. "in pace"; G. rightly omits.

11. סֹאמַחֵ [וְכַעֲנַת]. Cf. note on vs. 10. Here this word is used correctly.

12. וְשֹׁרִי with suffix = G.

סֹאמַחֵ [וְשֹׁרִי] with suffix = G.

13. כַּעַן [כַּעַן]. Cf. note on vs. 10. Again S. misunderstood this word.

מִן הָאֵלָּה חֵר [מִנְדָּה בָּלוּ וְהִלָּךְ לֹא יִתְּנוּ]. S. paraphrases MT's "tribute, custom, or toll they will not give" by "there will

be no tribute for thee". This paraphrase omits בלו and הלך which the translator apparently did not understand. בלו is the Assyrian *biltu*; הלך does not occur in Biblical Hebrew. Cf. GAB. φόροι οὐκ ἔσονται σοι = S. It looks as if S. and G. had read לך להוא לא (cf. Bewer *ad loc.*)

אפתם מלכים תהנוק. S. again paraphrases MT = "and the royal taxation will suffer damage" by "neither will she (*i.e.* the city) recognize kings" *i.e.* אפתם for אפתם which has been a source of conjecture from the earliest time of scientific criticism. The best reading is אפתם. The Greek versions did not know the meaning of this word either. תהנוק is then very freely translated, although S. knew its meaning quite well, cf. vs. 15.

14. כען. Cf. note in vss. 10, 11, 13.

למלכא. S. omits.

15. יבקר בספר. For MT's "let search be made in the book", S. has "do thou read the book".

ואשתדור. S. renders freely. Cf. note on 11.

16. ושורקה. S. and GB follow the K'thib = cf. vs. 12. מחלק. S. renders MT's "part" by "rule". This is a free but good translation.

17. S. connects vss. 16 and 17 by ו, the copula.

ושמש. S. carries over the force of על.

ואשר. This is due to the force of על as above.

כעת occurs elsewhere as כענת cf. vss. 10, 11. S. reads מ and connects with vs. 18. מ "when it arrives", represents a mere conjecture on the part of the translator. Cf. vss. 10, 13.

18. עלינא. S. renders correctly and naturally "to me", *i.e.* the king.

קר. S. renders a passive by 3 pl. active.

19. ܐܡܝܢ [ובקרו]. Cf. note on vs. 15.

ܐܡܝܢ [ואשתדור]. Cf. vs. 15.

20. ܐܡܝܢ [ומדה בלו והלך מתייהב להון]. MT "and tribute, toll, and custom was paid them". S. "and for the former kings they had no regard at all". S. here departs from MT in a radical manner. When we compare this verse with vs. 13, we see that the same difficulty was found with the loan word בלו (biltu) but מנדה was understood, while הלך (not found in Biblical Hebrew) caused difficulty. Here the translator who did not know the correct rendering has done the best he could and paraphrased.

21. ܐܡܝܢ [כען]. Cf. vs. 14.

22. ܐܡܝܢ. S. omits.

ܐܡܝܢ [מלכין]. Probably the plural sign was carelessly omitted by a copyist.

23. ܐܡܝܢ [מן־די]. "When it (the letter) came." This is a free but good translation.

ܐܡܝܢ [רחום]. With GL, S. alone preserves the original text. The title בעל־מעם must be inserted in the Aramaic. Cf. vss. 8, 9, 17.

ܐܡܝܢ [וכנותהון]. S. renders MT's "their companions" by "and before those who were their equals" as in vs. 7.

ܐܡܝܢ [אזלו]. S. renders freely.

ܐܡܝܢ [באדרע וחיל].

CHAPTER V

חגגה [ערווא.

נביאיה. S. has quite grammatically "Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo the prophet". This is certainly better than MT and it may present the original text. The alternative is to follow Esd. in omitting נביאה after חגגי.

3. שתר בוזני. This is due to a confusion of ; and and to the omission of final , which in the translator's Ms. may not have been written. S. quite correctly writes the names as one word.

חסה וחסה [להם. S. freely adds "and to the rest", interpreting MT's "to them" as applying only to the leaders, *i. e.* Zerubbabel and Jeshua.

לשכללה. This is a free but good translation. Cf. 4 16.

4. כנמא. Cf. note on 4 8.

אמרנה. S. and G. have preserved here the original text. MT must be emended to read אמרו.

5. אלההם. S. and G. omit the suffix.

חגגה [שבי. S. and G. translate "elders of" by "captivity of" because both read ש for ש.

חגגה [בטלו המו. The translator of S. omitted the pronoun and translated the pa'el as pe'al. MT "they did not compel them to stop"; S. "they did not stop".

6. אַמִּיבִּסְרִי [שְׁתַּר בּוֹזִי. Cf. note on vs. 3.

אֶפְרַסְכִּיָּא]. S. omits.

7. כְּלָא. S. omits.

8. לְבִית. S. omits.

וְהָיָה מִלְּטִי מִלְּטִי בְּרִצְמִי. S. freely renders MT's "and wood is put into the walls" by "and many transverse beams are joined together in its walls".

וְהָיָה מִלְּטִי מִלְּטִי [וְעִבְדִּתָּא דִּךְ אֶסְפְּרָנָא מִתְּעִבְדָּא וּמַצְלָח. S. paraphrases MT's "and this work is done diligently and prospers" by "and great works are done there; and the great work (literally, goes up and proceeds to the top) *i. e.* is progressing well". Note אֶסְפְּרָנָא is translated here by מִלְּטִי, it is omitted in 68, but in 612 is rendered by כִּי (quickly), in 721 it is rendered מִלְּטִי (zealously), and in 717, 26 by מִלְּטִי (carefully).

9. כְּנָמָא. S. here (also in vs. 11) correctly translates this word. Esd. omits. GAB = MT.

10. מִלְּטִי. S. and G. here have the plural. But this does not necessitate a different Aramaic original = שְׁמִהָת.

11. וְאֶרְעָא. Omits. S. has here the usual form מִלְּטִי = אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם. It is possible that S. has here preserved the better text as the phrase in the Persian period = S.

וְהָיָה מִלְּטִי מִלְּטִי. S. is paraphrastic "and the building of this house which we are building".

וְהָיָה מִלְּטִי מִלְּטִי. S. mistook the two words for one, *i. e.* רַב בְּנֵי cf. Dan. 51, 3.

12. בְּבִל. S. omits.

13. בְּבִל. S. correctly calls Cyrus King of Persia. MT's connotation is of course original, King of Babylon, is Cyrus's title also in the cuneiform inscriptions. GAB omit. Esd. = βασιλεύοντος Κύρου χώρας Βαβυλωνίας.

14. מִלְּטִי + [נְבוֹכַדְנֶצַּר.

בְּמִלְּטִי. Esd. also has the suffix ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ναῷ.

S's **ܠܠܗܝܠܐ ܕܝ ܒܒܠ** for MT **ללהיכלא די בבל** represents a free translation rather than a witness of a different Aramaic original.

ܡܡܥܪܐ [ܡܡܥܪܐ]. S. has a confusion of **ܡ** and **ܦ**.

ܫܡܝܐ [ܫܡܝܐ]. S. and G. read singular.

15. **ܡܡܥܪܐ ܡܡܥܪܐ** [ܡܡܥܪܐ]. S. freely renders "and bring (and) place".

ܐܠܗܐ. S. omits.

16. **ܡܡܥܪܐ ܡܡܥܪܐ** [ܡܡܥܪܐ]. This may not be the original Syriac reading but a scribal corruption of **ܡܡܥܪܐ**.

17. **ܡܡܥܪܐ ܡܡܥܪܐ** [ܡܡܥܪܐ]. MT's "in the king's treasury there which is in Babylon", S. renders "in the records, that are in the treasury of the kings of Babylon". That MT here is not the original text Esd. (ἐν τοῖς βασιλικοῖς βιβλιοφυλακίαις τοῦ κυρίου βασιλέως τοῖς ἐν Βαβυλῶνι) as well als S. bear witness. S. presents the nearest to the original (perhaps is original) = **ܡܡܥܪܐ ܡܡܥܪܐ ܕܝ ܒܒܠ**. Cf. Bewer, *ad loc.*

ܕܝ [ܕܝ]. This reading is also in several Aram. Mss. and in Esd. G. has both. S. has the preferable reading.

CHAPTER VI

1. **והוא חסדא דא חסדא** [והוא חסדא דא חסדא]. S. renders MT's "and they searched in the hall of records where the treasures were laid up" by "and he read the records which are in the treasury". S. gives a paraphrastic translation, keeping, as does G., Darius as subject. For the translation of **בקר** by **חסדא** cf. 4:15, 19.

2. **והשתכח** [והשתכח]. S. keeps the same subject as in vs. 1. **באחמחא** [באחמחא]. S. here preserves the original form of the Persian name. Cf. *BDB*.

בכירתא [בכירתא]. This may be a corruption of the original **בכירתא** which a copyist misread **בכירתא**, as a result of this, **מדינתא** after **במדי** was omitted.

בגוה דכרונה [בגוה דכרונה]. MT "(There was written) in it a record". S. "(und thus was written) in the volume". A copyist has inadvertently written **בגוה** for **בגוה**.

3. **שם נעסמל ספמ** [שם נעסמל]. This is a double translation. **די-בירושלם** [די-בירושלם] = **בירושלם**. So read several Aram. mss., Esd., G. and Vulg. This is the original text and MT must be corrected accordingly.

[ביתא]. S. omits, as do Esd. and GL, because their construction of the sentence does not require it.

מסובלין [מסובלין]. This manifestly is a serious scribal mistake for **מסובלין** = MT.

חמס [חמס]. S. corresponds here to I. Kings 62 and

apparently represents the original. MT was probably occasioned by the proceeding שתינ.

4. ܠܚܢ ܢܪܒܟܐ. It is not likely that S. had a different Aramaic text. Either this a free rendering facilitated by the (corrupt) reading ܚܪܬ which S. follows or it is a scribal correction for the original ܡܢܚܠ.

5. ܡܢܚܠ + ܢܒܚܕܢܨܪ. Cf. note on 11.

ܡܢ ܝܗܝܠܐ ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ. S. omits through oversight.

ܠܡܢܚܠ ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ ܝܗܝܠܐ ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ ܝܗܝܠܐ ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ. S. mistook the sense and translated MT's "let them restore and let it (all) come to the temple which is in Jerusalem, to its place" by "and they restored (them) and they came to their places to the temple which is in Jerusalem". S's suffixes are naturally correct, but that does not mean that S. had a different original Aramaic from MT. ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ and ܠܝܝܪܫܠܡ are doublets, of which the latter is secondary. A reader who missed it at the end inserted it.

ܠܡܢܚܠ ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ. S. translates MT's "and put down" by "and they assembled them together". MT is not correct, but S. translated freely. It seems most likely that the original translator wrote the imperfect of the various verbs in this verse as is demanded by the sense.

6. ܡܢܚܠ ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ. S. renders freely.

7. ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ. S. translates MT's "that governor of the Jews" by "that the Jews may do it". Some commentators would omit this passage in MT as a gloss. G^B omits, but GAL follow MT.

ܡܢܚܠ ܕܝܒܝܪܫܠܡ as in 55. S. makes good sense: "Leave the work of the house of God alone that the Jews may do it and also (let alone) the captivity of the Jews that the house of God may be built upon its place." It is not probable, however, that S. had a different underlying Aramaic.

17. S. omits.

8. **לחל יב לויס חמ עבדל יסדל דייתעבדון עס-שבייהודיא אלף.** S. renders MT's "what you shall do in cooperation with those elders of the Jews", by "take care that you do not quarrel with the captivity of the Jews". S. paraphrases.

18. S. omits.

9. **סמגלו די מרת** MT "out of the King's revenues which are from the tribute of Abarnahara" allows the Jews to have a portion "of the tribute" while S. more liberally "of the king's revenues and the tribute which (is gotten) in Abarnahara". This is an example of S's free rendering.

19. S. omits.

20. **סחבא לא יססא סחבא דיילא לבטלא** S. renders freely.

11. **סמג ירבי יסב לויס סמג חל אסמג לויס [ומה חשון]** S. renders MT's "and what they need" by "and give them what they wish and do not let anything be wanting for them". S. has here not only a doublet, but anticipates also the verb, which it translates again after the catalogue.

22. **אסל יסמב [כמאמר]** This is a free but good translation.

23. **לויס סמג [מתיהב]** S. translates MT's "causing it to be given" by "let them bring (or they shall bring)". This is a free translation.

24. **סמב [ניחוחין]** MT "incense" by "sacrifices" is a free rendering.

25. **חל סמב [לחיי מלכא]** S. freely renders "on behalf of the king" MT's "for the life of the king".

26. **סמב לויס [ומב סמפסמב חלסו] וזקיף יתמחא עלהי.** MT "and let him be crucified and fastened on it (i. e. the beam)". S. "and let them make him a cross and crucify him upon it". S. is a full and free rendering.

27. **ימעב די שכן** This is a copyist's error for **ימעב**.

28. This is a scribal doublet.

29. **ימנר** MT "he shall over throw"; S. "he shall dwell".

S. presents here a scribal error for ~~me~~. This is a confusion of ~~u~~ and ~~u~~.

לִב. S. "that he quickly perish". A scribe wrote
 ל for ו; the original Syr. was **ܠܒܚܝܩ**.

13. אמנחם [שחר בוני]. This is always so written in Ezra.

מִכֵּן : [לקבל דִּי- "Because" is rendered by S. "the thing that".

וְדָרְיוֹשׁ מִלְכָּא. S. carelessly omits.

א. S. did not understand this word.

14. **עשה שבי**. As in 55, 67, 8. S. mistakes ש for ש; in 59, however, S. translates correctly.

חֲבִיב [בנין]. S. translates freely.

ח. • [עדות Cf. 5 i.

וְאֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֵלֶּיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ. S. repeats the phrase.

16. גלותא יִשְׂרָאֵל. S. translates freely.

חַלְלוּ אֶת-בֵּית ה' בְּשִׂמְחָה וּבְהוֹדוֹת לַיהוָה
MT "the dedication of this house of God with joy"; S. "the
feast for this house, which is the house of God, with joy".
S. gives a needless repetition.

17.]דנה. S. omits.

MT "for a sinoffering for all Israel"; S. "to remit the sins of the Israelites". S. gives a free but good translation.

18. בפלגתהון and במחלקתהון]. S. renders freely by *separated*.

S. agrees with GL and is better than MT. We must insert therefore in the Aramaic text בית before אלהא.

אִי, וְהָלַב חֶלְבָּל, וְהָלַב וְהָלַב, וְהָלַב וְהָלַב [נכתב ספר משה
freely. Cf. note on I 1.

20. **מלה אמה חפז** [וישחטו הפסח] S. avoids the pregnant

Heb. construction "they killed the passover" by "and they killed the sheep at the passover".

וַיִּשְׁחָטוּ אֶת הַכֶּזֶבֶד [וְלֹהֶם]. S. renders freely.

21. מִבְּבֶלְיָא [מִהַגְלוֹה]. S. adds paraphrastically "of Babylon".

וְכָל [וְ] מִי. MT has not only the returned exiles but also all others who qualified; S. has only those of the returned who qualified.

[אֱלֹהִים]. S. omits as the sense did not seem to require it.

לְדַרְשׁ [לְדַרְשׁ]. MT "to seek", by S. "to pray before".

This is a free rendering.

22. הָאֱלֹהִים [וְ] מִי as often in S. cf. 1 6, 8, 3 8, 9.

CHAPTER VII

1. [האלה]. **חלבו**. S. freely expands.
4. **עזי**. **חב**. This is a copyist's error for **חב**. Cf. Neh. 12 19, 42.
5. **אלעזר**; **לחבו**. It is possible that this name was pronounced as by S.
הרש [הכהן הראש]. MT has "Aaron, the high priest". S. takes **הרש** with the next word, wrongly.
עלה [הוא עזרא עלה]. **עלה** **אל** **חזו**, **חלבו**. MT, "this Ezra went up". S. "Ezra was the first who went up". Cf. vs. 5.
6. **מהיר**. **שמעל**. S. renders freely.
כידיהוה [אלהיו עליו כל בקשתו]. **שמעל**, **אלה**, **חלבו**, **חלבו**. **כידיהוה** is translated by **חלבו**, **אלה**, **חלבו**. **כידיהוה** is represented by **חלבו**. This is strange, for in vs. 9 S. translates this phrase correctly. **חלבו** suggests that the translator mistook **כידיהוה** for **דת יהוה** and further **חלבו** suggests that he took the **לך** of **המלך** as a verb. S. = "the favor to walk in the law of the Lord as he wished".
7. **המשרתים** [המשרתים]. S. omits **ו** and translates **המשרתים**. v. 15. cf. note on 241.
והשערים. MT "and the porters"; S. "and some of the porters". This is merely a free rendering.
אל ירושלם. S. adds freely.

8. **ויבאו** = **וילאו** [ויבא]. 3 Heb. mss., GAB and Vulg. MT in Vss. 8—9 considers Ezra as subject and so uses the singular; the versions regard the exiles as subject and so use the plural.

9. **באחר**. S. omits.

הוא יסד. S. uses pl. as in vs. 8 *q. v.*; but had no different original text.

בא. Cf. note on vs. 8.

לפי ידו ולפי חסדו [כיד-אלהיו הטובה עליו]. MT "According to the good hand of his God upon him". S. "according to the hand of God which prospered them". Both MT and S. consistently carry out their preferences begun in vs. 8.

10. **לדרש**. S. renders freely and awkwardly, because the same verb follows almost directly afterwards again. It is therefore a fair question whether the original did not have **לדבר** which is the exact equivalent of **לדרש**. Cf. 10 16.

בשם. The plural signs may of course be due to a copyist.

11. **הספר** [הספר ספר דברי]. The versions have difficulties with this. GAB τῶ γραμματεῖ βιβλίου λόγων which corresponds to **ספר ספר דברי**. Esd. paraphrases 11^b and omits these words. S. simplifies by omitting **הספר** either deliberately or accidentally.

על-ישראל as in 7 1, S. adds **על** freely.

12. **מלך מלכא**. Cf. note on 11.

ספר דתא. S. adds **ספר** freely.

נמי. GAB, Esd., Vulg. have here all incorrectly translated. S. alone has preserved what the epistolary style demands, viz. "greeting", instead of MT's "perfect". Professor Beyer holds that the present MT is a corruption of

what must have stood here, viz: שלם. "Mir scheint in der Tat, in גמיר ein alter Fehler für שלם vorzuliegen, die erste Silbe גמ enthält noch einen Rest davon, die zweite יר scheint mir verdorbene Dittographie des folgenden וי zu sein. Der ursprüngliche Text lautete also: אלה שמיא שלם. So las auch Pesch."¹

וּבַעֲנַת. S. omits. Cf. note on 48.

13. *אם פּעבּל סטענעט נעשטל* [מני שים מעם]. S. renders freely and pleonastically to express the formal style.

ןלירושלם. S. omits.

14. אן פפגל שטאט נאכאל [כלי קבל די מן קדם מלכא. This is a repetition of vs. 13 where it represents the Aramaic מְנִי שֵׁם טַעַם.

שְׁבָעָה לִּי מַלְאָכָי. MT "and his seven
councillors, thou art sent". S. "and I have sent some of my
courtiers". S. does not only put the words in the first person
in the mouth of the king, as also in vs. 15, but omits שְׁבָעָה
and misinterprets the meaning of the original. S., of course,
gives sense but is in reality nothing but a free and incor-
rect translation.

10. **למשל חל נמשל ואלהיך בחיך** [ברת אלהיך די בידך] MT
 “according to the law (ברת must be read) of thy God which
 is in thy hand (*i. e.* with thee)”. S. “and also to inquire
 about the law of thy God which is in thy hands”. If S’s
 text is correctly handed down, the translator repeated for
 the sake of clearness **למשל חל**, misunderstanding the mean-
 ing of the original. But it is perhaps not quite impossible
 that this repetition is due to a copyist and that the original
 translator wrote **אלי** instead of **אלו**. If he did, his original

¹ Bewer: "Der Text des Buches Ezra", S. 69.

read כרת which was the original reading rather than ברת of MT.

יִוְעָטוּהִי. S. omits.

15. וְאֵלַי בְּחֶסֶד וְחֶסֶד מִנְדָּבוֹ. MT "have freely given". S. "which I have voluntarily offered". This is a free translation put into the first person singular.

לְחַמְלָא. For the interchange in the Divine name cf. 15, 38, 9, 622, 101, 6, 9. The addition of לְחַמְלָא is of no consequence for textual purposes.

16. וְכָל כֶּסֶף. S. omits the copula.

כָּל חַוָּה. חַוָּה is due to dittography.

חֶסֶד לְרַע [עִם הַתְּנִדּוֹת עִמָּא. MT "with the free will offerings of the people". S. "let go with thee". Cf. vs. 13. This is a very poor rendering.

וְנִכְהִינָא. S. freely adds וְנִכְהִינָא and understands מִתְּנִדְבִין to refer to the laymen, translating it וְנִכְהִינָא חֶסֶד "and those who wish to go with thee", and adds לְרַע "let them go", as a result of this faulty interpretation. S. renders very freely and quite incorrectly from an entirely different point of view.

17. בֵּית. S. omits.

18. וְכִסְפָּא וְדִהְבָּה. This is due to the influence of vs. 17.

וְאֵלֶּיךָ. S. translates with Ezra in mind.

19. וְאֵלֶּיךָ וְכִסְפָּא וְדִהְבָּה. MT here is quite unparalleled in Ezra. S. presents here the original אֱלֹהֵי דִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם, so also Esd., G. and Vulg.

20. וְכִסְפָּא וְדִהְבָּה וְכִסְפָּא וְדִהְבָּה. S. translates very freely.

[דִּי יִפֹּל לְךָ לְמִנְתָּן. S. omits.

וְתִתְּנָה. "Thou shalt take and give." The parallel translation of the entire verse shows the freedom of S.

MT

And whatsoever other requirement of the house of thy God it shall fall to thee to give, thou shalt give it from the king's treasury.

S.

And the rest of the vessels which are required by thee for the service of the house of thy God, thou shalt take, and give from the king's treasury.

21. [ספר דתא] ספן נחמל. Cf. vs. 11 MT.

[יתעבר] לחבס. S. renders freely.

22. [ועד בתין משח] וכל קלא. As in the foregoing in MT and in S. the order should be **בתין ועד משח**. The order of MT has been confused by a scribe.

23. [כלידי] כללל נלמס סכסכ לס + [כלידי]. "(Everything) shall be put on a slip of writing", *i. e.*, it shall be carefully noted down for reference, "and give to him", *i. e.*, to Ezra "(according to the precept of the God of heaven.)"

[יתעבר אדורא] נחב סכב. MT "let it to be done exactly". S., "he shall take it and use it". S. paraphrases.

24. [זמריא תרעיא נתיניא] סמז חמנל. MT "singers porters, nethinim". S. connects quite wrongly **תרעיא** with **תרועה** and got the meaning "trumpeters" for "singers and porters". The *nethinim* S. omitted.

[מנדה בלו והלק] לא שליט למרמא עליהם. S. omits as previously (cf. 4 13, 20) **מנדה בלו והלק** and then translates as if its Aramaic original read **לא שליט למאמר** עליהם. This is in reality merely a careless guess to make a smooth reading and to cover the translator's ignorance of the preceeding words.

25. [עורא] ספן + [עורא]. Cf. 11.

[כחכמת אלהק די בידק] ואלס נחב גר.

[שפמן] וסכב. S. renders freely.

[דת] נחמל. S. translates by a singular. The Greek ver-

sions also have the singular which Guthe and others believe is the original reading. Vs. 26 favours the sing. = דָּת.

26. מָתַל [לְשֵׁרֶשׁוֹ]. S. paraphrastically renders by the word that makes the natural antithesis to "death".

27. מַבְבֵּל וְיָלָן [כּוֹאֵת]. This is a free but good translation.

[אֲשֶׁר]. S. omits.

28. [וַיִּוְעֲצִיּוּ וּלְכָל]. S. omits.

אֶמְלָא, וְיָסַל חֲבֵט; וְסִסְמָא; מַבְבֵּל. S. paraphrases.

CHAPTER VIII

סוּכָּה מַעֲלָא יוֹסֵפִי וְאֵלֶּה רָאשֵׁי. S. adds freely after (and these are) "the names of" because a list of names follows.

אֲבֹתֵיהֶם. A scribe has carelessly changed the pronominal ending.

וְהִתְיַחֲשׁוּ. S. renders MT's "and their genealogy" by "who were reckoned by genealogy." This is a free translation. The following comparison of MT and S. shows the freedom the translator used:

MT

Now these are the chiefs of their fathers and their genealogy, (viz.) the ones going up with me in the reign of Artaxerxes, the king, from Babylon.

S.

Now these are *the names of the* chiefs of *your* fathers *who were reckoned by genealogy* and went up with me, in the reign of Artaxerxes, the king, from Babylon.

2. אֵלֶּה אֲבֹתֵינוּ for the original אֲבֹתֵינוּ. A scribe has written the shorter form as a result of haplography due to the similar ending of the preceding word.

3. חֲסֵי חֲסֵי. Cf. note on 26.

4. פַּחַת מִיָּאָה. S's usual way of writing this. Cf. note on 26.

אֵלֶּה אֲבֹתֵינוּ. S. wrongly divides this name into two names אֵלֶּה וְאֵלֶּה which necessitates the changing of חֲסֵי into חֲסֵי.

5. **בְּיָחִיאל** **בְּיָחִיאל** **בְּיָחִיאל**. S. has just as Esd.^{AB} and GA **Ζαχαρίας** = **זַחְרְיָהוּ** which has dropped from MT, for **זַחְרְיָהוּ** was certainly **זַחְרְיָהוּ**. Esd.^{AB} and GA insert **זַחְרְיָהוּ** after **מִבְּנֵי**, S. after **שְׁכֵנֵי**. **זַחְרְיָהוּ** is a scribal corruption of **זַחְרְיָהוּ**.

6. **וּמִבְּנֵי** **וּמִבְּנֵי** without the copula.

עֲרִין **עֲרִין**. Cf. note on 74 for a similar scribal error. The original **עֲרִין** or rather **עֲרִין** has easily been changed because of the similarity of **י** and **י**. The **ע** here has the hard sound = **ע** as in Gomorrah = **עֲמֹרָה**. S. follows a different vocalization than that of the Massorites.

עֲבָד **עֲבָד**. **ו** was perhaps originally the copula with the next word; in any case it is wrong.

7. **עֲתִלְיָה** **עֲתִלְיָה**. S. presents again a scribe's confusion of **י** with **י**, and of **י** with **י** for the original **עֲתִלְיָה**.

8. **זַבְדִּיָּה** **זַבְדִּיָּה**. S. presents here a scribal confusion of **י** and **י**, and **י** and **י**.

9. **יָחִיאל** **יָחִיאל**. S. presents the easy confusion of **י** for **י**. The original of course was **יָחִיאל**. Cf. vs. 5.

10. **שְׁלֹמִיָּה בְּיָחִיאל** **שְׁלֹמִיָּה בְּיָחִיאל**. The MT has evidently lost a word. S. noticed this and supplied it by writing **שְׁלֹמִיָּה** twice, in this way trying to make sense. We know from GA and Esdras that the missing word was **βααυ** = **בָּנִי** which MT lost by haplography. **שְׁלֹמִיָּה** is due to confusion of **י** and **י** and different vocalization. MT should read **וּמִבְּנֵי בָנֵי שְׁלֹמִיָּה** etc.

מֵאֵל **מֵאֵל** so also Esd.^{syr}.

11. **בְּבִי** **בְּבִי**. S. so in each case (twice), Esd.^L GL have **βοκχεῖ** = S.

12. **עֲזַרְיָה** **עֲזַרְיָה** for original **עֲזַרְיָה**; confusion of **י** and **י**.

הַקָּמָן **הַקָּמָן** is a copyist's error for **הַקָּמָן**. A scribe has confused **י** and **י**.

עשרה] חסר. This reading is also found in 38 Heb. Mss. and in Esd. L.

13. אדניקים] אדניקים. Confusion of א and י and of נ and מ.

אדניקים] אדניקים for original אדניקים. Confusion of א and י.

14. אדניקים] אדניקים. S. follows the K'rê of the Hebrew text, Vulg., Esd. LB also read as S. This is the original.

אדניקים] אדניקים so also several Heb. Mss.

אדניקים] אדניקים. This is a mistake due to the preceding verse.

15. אדניקים] אדניקים. This is a free translation.

אדניקים] אדניקים. So also vss. 21, 31.

אדניקים] אדניקים, originally this was אדניקים, so Thorndyke.

16. אדניקים] אדניקים for original אדניקים.

אדניקים] אדניקים. for original אדניקים.

אדניקים] אדניקים for original אדניקים.

אדניקים] אדניקים. S., as the text stands, paraphrases by "these were all of them chiefs" but the אדניקים is a mistake due to the preceding אדניקים. Originally the text read אדניקים or אדניקים which is the exact equivalent of מבינים.

אדניקים] אדניקים. This is the usual Syriac vocalization in Ezra.

17. אדניקים] אדניקים = K'rê of MT = אדניקים. This is preferable to the K'thib.

אדניקים] אדניקים. The mater lectionis was lacking in the translator's MS.

אדניקים] אדניקים. S. translates freely.

אדניקים] אדניקים mistake for אדניקים as before.

אדניקים] אדניקים, a correction of the translator.

אדניקים] אדניקים. S. renders MT's "Nethinim" by "those who dwelt", misunderstanding it and connecting it with the late Heb. meaning of נתן.

18. אדניקים] אדניקים. Cf. note on 79.

אדניקים] אדניקים. A copyist has omitted the א in אדניקים.

שמונה עשר. S. has 12 for MT's 18. This is a copyist's error. S. usually agrees with MT in numbers much closer than does Esd. but cf. note on vs. 26 below.

20. גתינים (twice). S. translates by גתי and by גתיים. S. felt the original force of the word. We are used to regard Nethinim almost like a name; but it was merely the designation of the old temple slaves.

והשרים S. omits through oversight.

בשמות. S. renders freely.

21. שם צום. The translator misunderstood צום "fast", and connected it with צוה "command". ׀ he took as the suffix, and שם he omitted.

לזר originally.

לזר. The Syriac reading is here probably corrupt. The original read לזר or לזר.

22. על. S. renders freely MT's "upon" by "with".

בבית. S. translates a collective by a plural. Cf. vs. 31.

אלהינו. S. omits the suffix here but in vs. 23 = MT. This may perhaps be a scribal corruption from אל as vs. 23.

24. שרי. S. regards by the translator as an equivalent, — a free rendering. Cf. 92.

שש. S. with Esd. AB preserves an original reading. Cf. Bewer ad loc.

25. וואשקולה. S. freely renders MT's "weighed" by "counted".

תרומה. S. renders freely.

שש, a free translation.

ל + הנמצאים freely.

26. על-ידם. S. renders freely by חלום.

שש-מאות וחמשים. This is an unusual case be-

cause S. agrees with MT regarding numerals much better than the other versions.

וכלי-כסף מאה לככרים זהב מאה ככר S. (as Esd. A) omits.

27. [לאדרכנים] ^{א.י.ס.} S. translates ל by •.

מלקא [כפרי] S. freely renders "bowls" by "platters."

מסעלל [מצהב] S. translates freely "corinthian" which is a synonym for precious. Cf. I. Kings 7 45. I. Ch. 297.

שנים S. omits.

י.עפעץ [חמודת] S. renders quite freely.

29. [תשקלו] ^{א.י.ס.} Cf. vss. 25, 26, 33.

חסעלל [הלשכות] S. renders freely.

30. S. adds חלססן.

י.עפעץ חעלמלל [משקל] S. renders freely.

31. חכלכחץ [אויב] S. translates a collective by a plural, as in vs. 22.

33. ^{א.י.ס.} [עליד] S. translates freely.

י.ס.חץ [ויוזבד] This is a scribe's error for י.ס.חץ.

י.ס.חץ [נועדריה] for original י.ס.חץ. A scribe has miscopied.

י.ס.חץ [בנוי] The translator mistook בנוי for בנוי.

34. ^{א.י.ס.} [במשקל] The copula must be inserted in MT, as Esd., G., Vulg., as well as S. show.

35. י.ס.חץ [בני] S. renders freely.

י.ס.חץ ^{א.י.ס.} [צפירי חמאת] Cf. 6 17.

י.ס.חץ ^{א.י.ס.} [הכל עלה] S. translates freely but well; the original Heb. did of course not read עלות.

36. י.ס.חץ [דתי] = διάταγμα, GAB τὸ νόμισμα. S. knows only one decree.

י.ס.חץ ^{א.י.ס.} [נשא] S. translates MT's "helped" by "were honoring". The translator misunderstood the meaning (cf. I 4) employed here by MT thinking it signified "lift up" = honor. Esd. and G made the same error.

CHAPTER IX

1. $\text{חלל} + \text{אלה}$.

$\text{מעטל} [\text{השרים}]$. S. translates here according to the sense.

$\text{חלל}, \text{חלל}, \text{חלל}$. S. translates as if MT read עם העם ישראל but S. had no different original text.

חלל . This is the usual translation in Ezra. Cf. 33, 92, 7.

$\text{חלל} = \text{חלל}$ so also G, and this was most probably the original reading.

S. has different order, $\text{חלל} \text{חלל} \text{חלל}$.

2. $\text{מעטל} [\text{השרים} \text{ והסגנים}]$. The translator here disagrees with MT which holds the political officials guilty. The translator of S. holds the religious leaders guilty. This is of course only an interpretation by S., who had the same text as MT. G omits והסגנים which leads Guthe, Bertholet and others to hold it to be a doublet of שרים . Bewer, on the other hand, upholds the MT. Cf. "*Der Text des Buches Ezra*" ad loc.

3. בגדי . S. with Esd. and G. reads the plural בגדי which is to be preferred to MT.

4. $\text{חלל} \text{חלל} \text{חלל}$. S. "all who were concerned about the word" (sing.) The singular $\text{חלל} = \text{בדבר}$ was probably the original reading. It is vouched for also by Esdras and Vulg.

אחדה חת מצד. S. renders freely but well.

למנחת הערב. S. renders paraphrastically, substituting the time "ninth hour" for the "evening offering" which was at this time (3 p. m.) Cf. Acts 3 1.

5. **חברא, ואלה עמם** [במנחת הערב. Cf. note on vs. 4.

ש. renders freely. **מ. ס. מ.** [בקרעי]

plur. as in vs. 3, also here correct.

S. adds freely **מה** the correct explanation.

כא] מ. S. shows a fine sense of reverence.

אלהי. S. omits the suffix.

6. בשתי ונכלמתי חלה. S. reads plural; MT sing.

אלהי. S. reads plural and changes order of words.

plur. suffix. [פני]

plur. S. freely adds **שלום** [ואשמחנו גדלה]

7. אנחנו]. S. adds freely but well **אעפס**.

בַּאֲשָׁמָה נִדְלָה. S. plur. as in vs. 6.

S. para-
phrases.

[בשבי ובבוה. S. has the reverse order.

אנחנו²]. S. adds freely **ואח**.

S. adds freely **וְהַחֲכָמִים** S. changes the order and paraphrases freely in this verse.

8. **ח. מלא רחב**; [כמעט רגע. This is free and good.

יהוה]. S. omits, as does GB.

יִתֵּד. S. translates freely.

וְלִתְּנוּ. S. omits suffix.

9. וַיֵּץ עָלֵינוּ. S. adds אֵלֵינוּ.

סעודתנו יומית. S. translates freely by "our daily support".

freely. • מִן־מַחְמָדָם לְרוֹמָם

freely. וְלִתְּ-לָנוּ

10. נאמר. S. adds freely מן סוגי.

שלם פלגם [זות]. S. renders freely, cf. q 1.

11. צוית. S. adds suffix freely עמל.

ארץ. S. omits as unnecessary in the translation.

לאמר. S. renders freely.

עמי הארצות עמל, probably the copula is due to a copyist.

עמל. S. paraphrases.

12. עמל. S. translates pleonastically and not very differently from MT = "and leave it for an inheritance".

13. עמל. Cf. vs. 1, 10.

עמל plur. as in vs. 7.

MT "thou hast punished us less than our sins (warrant)". S. "thou hast planned for us to forgive our sins". This comes from the reading עמל for עמל which 9 Heb. Mss. have.

עמל. S. renders freely.

14. עמל. S. loses the rhetorical question of MT rendering, "Is it possible that again we shall trespass" by "We have turned away and trespassed". G makes a similar error.

Again S. overlooks the question MT "or marry people of these abominations" and renders freely "and we went and clung to these unclean folks"; and freely adds עמל. S. disregards the question again and presents here a lengthy paraphrase: "But thou art merciful. Thou wilt not be angry with us. Forgive our transgressions from before thee. Because thou art merciful, leave us remnants in the world, because there is none like thee; and may we not perish."

15. עמל. S. paraphrases: "We stand and confess before thee our sins."

עמל. S. paraphrases.

CHAPTER X

1. $\text{ܐܠܗܐ ܐܥܠܐ ܒܝܬܐ ܕܡܬܢܦܠ}$ [בכה ומתנפל]. S. changes the word order. ܐܠܗܐܝܢ [האלהים]. Cf. 15, 38, 9, 622, 715.
 - ܠܥܠܐ ܕܥܠܐ ܕܥܠܐ [בכו העם]. S. renders instead of "the people wept"; "the children were weeping".
 - ܐܠܗܐ ܐܥܠܐ ܕܥܠܐ [הרבה בכה]. Cf. 11.
 2. ܐܠܗܐ ܐܥܠܐ is a scribal confusion of ܐ for ܐ . The original was ܐܠܗܐ .
 - ܥܝܠܐܡ = MT ܕܥܝܠܐܡ [עולם].
 - $\text{ܥܝܠܐܡ} + \text{ܥܝܠܐܡ}$. Cf. note on 11.
 - ܥܝܠܐܡ ܐܠܗܐ [באלהינו]. Cf. vs. 1.
 3. $\text{ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܐܡ ܐܠܗܐܝܢ}$ [נכרת-ברית לאלהינו]. S. translates freely MT's "let us make a covenant with our God" by "let us say oaths before our God".
- ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܐܡ [נשים]. MT is obviously incorrect as only the foreign wives were meant. GABL support the reading of S., accordingly we should emend MT to read ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܐܡ . It is possible that the translator has used his prerogative of making clear what was meant and that the original text read ܐܠܗܐܝܢ or ܐܠܗܐܝܢ . Professor Bewer (ad loc) adopts the latter on the ground that "Die Einfügung lässt sich leicht, die Auslassung schwer erklären".
- ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܐܡ = ܐܠܗܐܝܢ ܕܥܝܠܐܡ [בעצת]. So also GAB and many oriental Heb. mss. This is the correct reading; the interchange of

ב and כ was easily made in the Heb. MT must be accordingly mended.

חַבֵּי [יַעֲשֶׂה] MT "let it be done". S. "do". S. connects the following קוּם cf. vs. 4 with this imperative וְאֵלֶּי "and confirm". MT is better.

4. חַבֵּי וְאֵלֶּי פֶּסַח פֶּסַח וְאֵל [עַלֶּיךָ הַדָּבָר]. S. paraphrases "(for) on thy account this decision has been decided".

וְאֵלֶּי [וְאֵלֶּיךָ] is repeated because of the foregoing paraphrase.

וְאֵלֶּי + עוֹרָא. Cf. note on 11, 102.

5. מִפְּתֵי [שָׂרִי]. This is S's usual paraphrase of this word. Cf. 824, 91.

וְהַכֹּהֲנִים הָלִוִּים. S. reads the copula with GAB and Esd. This is obviously the original reading = הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם.

אֵל פֶּסַח [כְּדָבָר]. S. brings out the specific sense of כְּדָבָר here.

6. עוֹרָא + וְאֵלֶּי. As in vss. 2 and 5.

וְאֵלֶּי [הָאֱלֹהִים]. As in vs. 1.

אֶלֶּי [לְשֹׁכֶת]. S. reads pl.

אֶלֶּי [אֶלֶּיךָ]. S. is the result of scribal carelessness which changed אֶלֶּי into אֶלֶּיךָ by miscopying the א. Esd. AB and GAB vouch for the originality of MT.

וְאֵלֶּי = וְאֵלֶּיךָ. A scribe has carelessly written ך for ך in MT. S. preserved the original reading. Cf. Esd.

וְאֵלֶּי [הַגּוֹלָה]. S. paraphrases.

7. וְאֵלֶּי מִפְּתֵי [וְאֵלֶּיךָ]. S. freely and correctly paraphrases MT's "they made proclamations" by "and the priests proclaimed".

וְאֵלֶּי [וְאֵלֶּיךָ]. S. here has preserved the original which is vouched for by many Heb. Mss. also by G. The context also demands it in agreement with the previous "in Judea".

לכל סבא. Again S. construes as in the foregoing and reads "and among all the captives." In MT the proclamation is to the exiles alone; S. has it to all the province of Judea, to the capital *and* to the exiles.

יירושלם + סבא. Cf. note on 11.

8. כעצת + סבא. S. renders freely.

יממלא סבא. S. has a different order.

מקהל הנולה. S. interprets. Cf. vs. 6.

9. הוא חדש. S. renders freely.

בכעשרים. This is due to a scribe's carelessness.

ישבו. S. renders freely.

בברחוב בית. S. omits through oversight.

האלהים. Cf. vs. 1.

סבא סבא. "Quaking and shivering because of the matter." S. either translated pleonastically מרעידים (cf. vs. 12) and omits ומהגשמים (cf. vs. 12) or took the latter wrongly for ומגעשים.

10. מעלחם + סבא. Cf. vs. 2.

אשמת. S. reads plur. as usual.

12. קהל. S. interprets as in vss. 6 and 8.

ויאמרו. Cf. note on 11.

כן כדבריק עלינו לעשות. If S. is not simply a free paraphrase, its present text may contain a doublet of which the original *חלף חלף* "thy words to us" was *later* corrected by *אמנו חלף לעמנו* "and acceptable is everything which thou tellest us to do in truth". Perhaps the second translation (correction) was written on the margin and a later scribe incorporated it into the text. We may still further ask, was *חלף חלף* still another translation of *כן*?

13. אבל. S. translates freely.

אין כח. S. translates freely.

14. לכל-הקהל. S. did not represent the meaning

of the original correctly according to which the leaders were to represent the whole congregation in this matter. On **חבא** cf. vs. 12.

חבבא, **חבבא**, **חבבא** [לעתים מומנים]. S. here misinterprets "the appointed times" by "the time of prayer".

חבבא [חרון אף]. S. uses one term for the two Hebrew words.

חבבא **חבבא** **חבבא** [עד לדבר הזה]. MT is evidently wrong and must be corrected here to **על הדבר הזה**. Two Heb. Mss. GAB Vulg. read **על**. It is true that S. paraphrases in **חבבא** but has the exact sense, and may therefore be regarded as a witness of the true text.

15. **חבבא** [עשהאל]. This is a copyist's carelessness for the original **חבבא**. Cf. v. 6 for a similar mistake in the Syriac.

חבבא [יחזיא]. This is a scribal error for **חבבא**.

[**חבבא**]. A copyist has misplaced this name.

חבבא **חבבא** **חבבא** [על-זאת]. Cf. note on 11.

חבבא [שבת]. This is a confusion of **ש** (written here **ח**) and **ש** (cf. first word in this verse where a similar error occurs and also vs. 6) with the omission of **ח**.

חבבא [עזרא]. S. points the Heb. differently and renders here "(was) their helper", the subject is Shabbethai, the Levite. In MT Meshullam, who is misplaced in S., was also the subject, "they helped them".

16. **חבבא** [ויבדלו]. S. with GL **καὶ διέσπειλεν** gives evidence of an original **ויבדלו** which MT also demands in that Ezra alone is subject. MT must here be corrected.

חבבא + **חבבא**. S. freely adds **חבבא**.

חבבא + **חבבא**. S. has a free addition to bring out the meaning.

חבבא **חבבא** **חבבא** [לדרוש]. This is the correct reading. MT must accordingly be corrected.

17. $\text{בכל האנשים} = \text{בכל אנשי}$ בכל אנשים . This is the correct reading. MT must be accordingly corrected.

18. $\text{שם} = \text{שם}$. The translator read the fuller from שם = שם which a scribe corrupted into שם .

19. $\text{ויתנו ידם} = \text{ויתנו ידם}$. S. renders freely "and they also consented".

ואשמים . S. omits ואשמים and supplies "they offered" in order to make sense. Cf. RV. which reads both.

איל-צאן . S. has the plural.

20. אמר . Cf. 2 59.

זבדי . S. reads with 9 Hebrew Mss. that which may have been the original. The confusion is as easily explained in Hebrew as in Syriac.

21. יחיאל . This is a scribal corruption of the original יחיאל .

22. אליועני . In vs. 27, S. has אליועני which shows that the original was אליועני in vs. 27 and אליועני here.

ישמעאל . This is an error for ישמעאל .

נתנאל . S. gives here the other common form of this name.

זוּבַד . This is due to an exchange of ז and ז for the original זוּבַד .

23. זוּבַד . This is due to a scribe's carelessly writing ז for ז and ז for ז .

מַלְאִי . S. interprets the names as belonging to two distinct individuals; but this is due to the carelessness of a scribe who wrote מ for מ . מַלְאִי shows the confusion of מ for מ .

24. $\text{המשרתים} = \text{המשרתים}$. Cf. 2 41.

אלישיב . This is the result of careless copying. The original was אלישיב . A scribe changed ב and ב to ב . Cf. the same error in vs. 6.

שלם. This is due to the absence of *mater lectionis* in MT; the final • is a dittography of the following copula.

אורי. This is due to an interchange of ; and ; for the original אורי.

25. אורי. The • is dittography for •.

חנני. A careless scribe has written a more common name which resembled closely the one he found in his text.

חנני. This is for the original חנני or חנני.

26. חנני. The aural confusion here is due to both names being so common and thus easy to confuse.

חנני. This is a corruption of the original חנני or חנני by a confusion of • and • and of • and •.

חנני. This form is due to the following copula which S. connects with the fuller form of the name חנני.

27. חנני. The seǵame points are, of course, a scribal error, due, perhaps, to a thoughtless connection with "olive trees". The mistaken pronunciation again may come from the name חנני = חנני.

חנני. This is for the original חנני. Cf. note on vs. 22 also 84.

חנני. *Mater lectionis* was wanting in Ms. used by translator.

חנני. Cf. vs. 26.

חנני. This is due to an interchange of ; and ; and to a different vocalization.

חנני. This is a copyist's corruption of the original חנני due to the more common but different name.

29. חנני. S. reads as does one Heb. Ms. Confusion of • and •.

חנני. This may be due to a careless copyist rather than to the translator.

עדיה] **חבל**. S. reads as does one Heb. Ms. Confusion of ו and י. Cf. v. 28.

שוב] **שכב**. This is a scribe's careless copying.

שאל] **שאל**. S. supplied the more common pronunciation.

30. פחת] **פחת**. S. always so translates in Ezra.

עדנא] **עדנא**. The ו is a mistake א and the א is a mistake for א. Note how a good common name results from these mistakes.

ובניו בני מנשה = **ובניו בני מנשה**. The translator missed the word and by the interchange of ו and ו has changed the name "Binnui" into "his sons".

31. חרם] **חרם**. S. and G^{AB} also many Heb. Mss. have here the original reading. MT must be corrected to read **חרם**. G^{AB} Esd. ABL all vocalize חרם as S. does. MT = חרם which must also be corrected to חרם.

מלכא] **מלכא**. S. has here a different order. S. read originally **מלכא** for **מלכא**.

32. שמריה] **שמריה**. A copyist mistook this for the more common name.

33. מתתה] **מתתה**. S. vocalizes differently.

זבר] **זבר**. S. again confuses ז and ז and ז and ז.

ירמי] **ירמי**. This is a copyist's error for **ירמי**. A scribe has confused ז and ז and ז and ז.

34. בני] **בני**. Cf. vs. 29 where the "sons of Bani" are already listed. S. must be correct as one clan would not be listed twice. At least one is wrong either in vs. 29 or here. MT should therefore probably be corrected to S. = בני.

מעדי] **מעדי**. This is due to a different vocalization.

אואל] **אואל** = **אואל** to which Esd. ABL and GBL also testify. Cf. Beyer *ad loc.* MT must be accordingly corrected.

35. בדיה] **בדיה**. A copyist read ז for ז and this led to the omission of ז, hence **בדיה**.

כלוהו, K're כלוהו = כלוהו which may have preserved the original reading.

36. [וניה] וניה. MT is corrupt; but S. does not seem to have preserved the correct reading.

אלשיב. Cf. vs. 27.

37. [ויעשו] ויעשו. S. in its corrupted state seems to have followed K're and to have read originally ויעשו. (Cf. note on vs. 36). ו was corrupted to ו.

38. [ובני ובניו] ובני ובניו. This is a scribal corruption for the original ובני ובניו, i. e., the second without ו = "and the sons of Binnui," so also G. MT must be accordingly corrected.

39. [עדיה] עדיה. Cf. vs. 29. A scribe mistook it for the common name, an aural error. ד softly and badly spoken sounded like ז. Cf. Heb. עזר and Syr. عزر and the French pronunciation of the English *the*.

40. [מכנרבי] מכנרבי. This is for מכנרבי. But both MT and S. are corrupt.

[שרי] שרי. The translator read ש for ש.

41. [עזראל] עזראל. This is a corruption for the original עזראל in its Syriac form.

[ושלמיהו]. S. omits.

43. [יעיאל] יעיאל. This is a copyist's mistake for the original יעיאל.

[מתחיה] מתחיה. Cf. note in vs. 33.

[ובד] ובד. Cf. vs. 27. S. reads with 1 Heb. Ms.

[ידו]. S. omits.

44. [נשאו] נשאו = K're נשאו.

[נשים וישימו] נשים וישימו. MT here is corrupt. S. read the same text and tries to express the meaning by "and there were among them men who had begotten sons".

Ezra, Book of 194240 Bible
Author Hawley, C.A. Comment(O.T)
Ezra
Title A critical xamination of the Peshita H.....
version of the Book of Ezra.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File"
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU